

PERIODICAL REGISTERED  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
THEY OF WHICH

MAY 8 1946

April, 1946

# THE DUBLIN REVIEW

*Edited by T. S. GREGORY*

---

*This issue includes:*

**John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's**

W. E. CAMPBELL

**The Cambridge Prelude to 1895**

OUTRAM EVENNETT

**Lumen de Lumine**

A. H. ARMSTRONG

**The Jewish Question**

H. S. OESTERREICHER

---

**BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.**  
5 NORFOLK ROAD, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM  
28 ASHLEY PLACE, S.W.1  
AND 21/22 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN

Price 3*s*. 6*d*. or \$1 net. Yearly Subscription, 15*s*. or \$4 Post Free.

Registered as second-class matter at the Post Office at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879 (section 123, P.L. and R.).

# CONTENTS

## APRIL, MAY, JUNE,

### 1946

|  | <small>PAGE</small>        |
|--|----------------------------|
| John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's   | 97                         |
| The Cambridge Prelude to 1895  | By Outram Evennett 107     |
| Lumen de Lumine  | By A. H. Armstrong 126     |
| The Jewish Question  | By H. S. Oesterreicher 137 |
| Reflections on Mediaeval Clerical Taxation   | By W. Ullmann 151          |
| The Royal Question in Belgium  | By H. Hannsen 162          |
| Tito's Yugoslavia  | By C. E. Polson 171        |
| <hr style="width: 100%; border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin: 10px 0;"/>                 |                            |
| Some Recent Books  | 187                        |
| THE CRITICISM OF EXPERIENCE. THE DIVINE PITT. SOME HELLENISTIC ELEMENTS IN PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. |                            |

COMMUNICATIONS in regard to articles and all books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, THE DUBLIN REVIEW, 28 Ashley Place, London, S.W.1, and all communications respecting the Publishing Department, to the Manager at the same address. Advertisements should reach the Publishers not later than the 10th of the last month of each Quarter.

No MSS. can be returned unless accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes. Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published on the 1st January, April, July and October.

is  
7  
6  
7  
62  
7  
87  
all  
or,  
on,  
ng  
ss.  
ter  
by  
be  
e is  
rst



# The Dublin Review

APRIL, 1946

No. 437

## JOHN COLET, DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S

IN the years immediately preceding the English reformation there were two groups of people gravely concerned about the Catholic Church. One group consisted of those who were altogether loyal to the Church, and, because they were loyal, were eager to do what was in their power to change it for the better—but *from within*. The other group was made up of men who, ultimately, left the Church, and became, on the Protestant side, and *from without*, its bitterest enemies. In the first group, St. John Fisher, St. Thomas More, and Erasmus occur to us as memorable; while in the second the name of William Tyndale stands out in particular prominence. But to these four names a fifth should surely be added—that of John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's from 1505 to 1519, the year of his death; for if there was one man to whom, under God, St. Thomas More owed the formation of his spiritual character and the beginnings of his sanctity, that man was John Colet. Furthermore, he was the close friend and counsellor of Erasmus. But, considered in and by himself, Dean Colet was a great ecclesiastic, a man of sterling character, powerful mind, and deep Catholic convictions. He is remembered for the most part by ordinary Englishmen as the founder of St. Paul's School, and all that that meant for the future of English Public School life.

Today, in fact, Dean Colet is all too little known; or perhaps we should rather say, known as he really was. Mr. Lupton, his authoritative and most careful biographer, himself the late surmaster of St. Paul's School, tells us that, so far as he knew, Colet "was not once mentioned in the histories of Hume and Lingard, while in Green's *Short History of the English People* an importance altogether unique is assigned to the part he played". But after reading what Mr. Green has there written about him, we feel constrained to say that "the part assigned to Colet" was the part he did *not* play. To this, however, later reference will be made; but it may be well to add, incidentally, a second opinion of not quite the same character as that of Mr. Green.

The glory of Colet, Erasmus and More is that they maintained undimmed throughout their careers their ideal of the Church of Christ as a Catholic society, and that no possible combination of self-interest with hopes of

success for their schemes could have availed to detach them from that Catholic unity.\*

Or again, in Mr. Frederic Seebohm's delightfully written *Oxford Reformers*, Colet is unmistakably the author's hero—but hardly a Catholic hero at that, although Colet lived and died a Catholic.

In truth, it would seem as if all three of these learned men somehow missed the Catholic soul of Dean Colet: and perhaps because they had never seen with the eyes of faith what St. Thomas More liked to call "Christ's Catholic Church".

But while writing these last few lines, a memory comes to my mind that at least may serve as a pointer in the right direction.

On the last day of July 1547, in the first year of Edward VI's reign, a royal injunction went forth that the interiors of all the churches in the country should be whitewashed—the intention being to banish from sight and memory the beautiful designs and colours that for centuries had done so much to foster Catholic devotion.

And so all images pulled down through all England at the time, and all churches new white-limed, with the commandments written on the walls.†

Walter Crane, speaking of the interior decorations of our English pre-reformation churches, writes:

It is difficult to realize the splendour of effect once possessed by every important mediaeval church. From the tiled floor to the roof, all was one mass of gold and colour. The brilliancy of the mural paintings and richly coloured sculpture and mouldings was in harmony with the splendour of the oak-wood screens, stalls and roofs—all decorated with gilding and painting, while the light, passing through the stained glass, softened and helped to combine the whole into one mass of decorative effect.‡

May it not be said, therefore, that just as so many of our pre-reformation churches and cathedrals are at long last being un-whitewashed and revealed to us once again in their old and true Catholic colours, so, too, are the biographical portraits of these three and of other undoubtedly Catholic men of the same period? Has not Father Bridgett, in his standard *Life of Sir Thomas More*, removed the non-Catholic whitewash from the portrait of that great Englishman? And in much the same way,

\* Cf. G. V. Jourdan, *The Movement of Catholic Reform in the Early Sixteenth Century*. Introduction, p. 30.

† James Gairdner, *A History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 246-248: *Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London* (Camden Society), p. 54.

‡ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, Vol. XIX, p. 23. See also E. W. Tristram, *English Medieval Wall Paintings*, 12th Century, 1944.

the late Dr. P. S. Allen, with massive and unprejudiced learning, has "restored" to us the portrait of Erasmus, as we find him in his new great edition of *Erasmii Epistolae*, which he almost completed in ten volumes,

Erasmus, that great injured name,  
The glory of the priesthood and the shame.\*

Mr. F. M. Nichols has also given us a three-volume English translation of the *Epistles of Erasmus* down to 1518, making them even more attractive by his adequate notes and interesting comments. Other books, too, are carrying on this good work of Erasmian restitution.

Just here and now something of the same kind will be attempted on behalf of Dean Colet, who was born at Wendover, in Berkshire, in 1466, a few months later than Erasmus, who, later, was to become his friend. His father, Sir Henry Colet, was a well-to-do City magnate, twice Lord Mayor of London, and in favour at the Court of Henry VII. John Colet was educated at one of the City schools, and from there, it would seem, went up to Oxford, possibly to Magdalen College, about 1483, a tall, well-looking youth of great promise. At the University he excelled in mathematics, mastered the philosophy of the Schools, was familiar with Cicero, and had a particular bent towards Plato and Platonism which he could have further gratified on his post-graduate tour through France and Italy between 1493 and 1497.

But he has left us all too little positive evidence of that continental journey of his, and when in Italy does not deign to mention the places he stayed at or the interesting people he must have met. All we can safely do is to follow Mr. Lupton in what may be described as a region of conjecture and surmise.

From Archbishop Parker we gather that Colet "studied for a long time in foreign universities, staying at Orleans and at Paris, both on his outward and on his return journey".

We may not unfairly conclude [writes his biographer] that Colet would visit Bologna and Florence on his way to Rome. . . . The objects which a young student from Western Europe would have in travelling in Italy are not far to seek. The universities north of the Alps were, in Colet's time, far behind those of the Peninsula. Not to speak of the munificent patrons of literature found in the Medici family, it was in Italy that the exiles from Constantinople had met with an asylum, and there the Greek learning they brought with them struck root and flourished again. . . . The great univer-

\* Pope, *Essay on Criticism* (1709). *Works*, I, pp. 224-5. Pope, it will be remembered, was a Catholic poet. Croker thus interprets the second line: "The glory, from his greatness the shame, from the rancour with which some of his brother priests assailed him."

sities were not so self-complete as now. In most cases each had a special reputation, Paris for theology, Bologna for law, Salerno for medicine, and the like. Learned men, moreover, were tempted to a migratory life as professors, by the various inducements held out to attract them. . . . Whether Colet was one of the Englishmen attending the lectures of Beroaldus (at Bologna) cannot now be discovered . . . (but) his familiarity with canon law, shown in his Convocation sermon and elsewhere, would have made it probable; while his acquaintance with the writings of Pico della Mirandola and of Marsiglio Ficino forms a connecting link with Florence.\*

At that moment of time Florence was at the height of her intellectual, artistic and social fame.

What an array of illustrious names were to be found there:

"And when I think that Michael Angelo  
Hath leaned on me, I glory in myself,"

is the utterance ascribed by the poet to the Ponte Vecchio in Florence . . . Leonardo da Vinci was there; so was Fra Bartolommeo, whose pencil was even then adorning the walls of San Marco; so was Brunelleschi, who a fifty years before, had crowned the Cathedral with the famous dome that made it tower over St. Peter's. Bramante might often have been seen there, Machiavelli was in Florence, and Colet may often have passed the man, slightly his own junior.†

In this period, too, though perhaps somewhat earlier, other young Englishmen who afterwards became famous visited Italy—Grocy and Lincre, for instance, who are sometimes said to have been the first to do so, and to promote the revival of letters in England. But even before them William Selling and his companion, William Hadley, two Benedictine monks of Christchurch, Canterbury, made their journey to Italy and brought back to England on their return the better rather than the bitter fruits of the Italian Renaissance.‡

Colet, in fact, was somewhat indifferent to the classical and aesthetic, as distinguished from the religious, side of Florentine life; not being, it would appear, over-susceptible to the "pure beauty of form" then so much sought after under high Medicean patronage. Some may have thought him to be of the unnoticing sort; others, more understanding, may have discerned that he was a contemplative, one given to introversion, and to going apart into quiet churches where he could "remain in cessation and silence before God".

\* *Life of Dean Colet*, pp. 47-50 *serialim*.

† *Life of Dean Colet*, p. 51.

‡ Dom William Selling afterwards became prior of his own monastery at Canterbury, and was sent on an embassy with others, as Latin orator, to inform Innocent VIII of Henry VII's accession. See Cardinal Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation*, chap. ii. "The Revival of English Letters".

We can thus understand his preference for the writings of Ficino and of Pico della Mirandola, a liking that he later communicated to Sir Thomas More. But perhaps most of all, we may infer, he was impressed, and deeply impressed, by the great prophetic figure of Savonarola, then at the height of his fame, a man after his own heart, and not unlike him in disposition, in character, and in his personal reactions to wickedness in high places, and in low.

Savonarola [writes Father Ryder, the Oratorian] is not safeguarded by the sanction of authority, as are the canonised saints; still there is something, one would think, due to the type apart from individual registration. . . . I suppose one main ground for regarding Savonarola as a saint, *i.e.* a conscientious persistent soldier of Christ, ever combating for the right as it appears to him, and on the highest motives, the love of God, is this, that besides his actual fighting for the cause of God, he has given clear evidence of a deep spiritual life which he not only lived himself, and from which he nourished numberless children of grace who would say, "In thy light we shall see light." From his earliest days with his novices at St. Mark's, to the last days of the dungeons of the Signory, when, with a frame broken by torture and his reputation shattered, he converted his jailor by energy of prayer—Burlamacchi says that the man found him raised from the ground in ecstasy—he was able to supply his neighbours' lamps with an oil that never failed.\*

Father Ryder gives it as his own opinion of Father Lucas's *Fra Girolamo Savonarola* that

to Fr. Lucas Savonarola appears as a meteor, on the whole a benign influence, but which has failed of being a star through refusing to revolve in its prescribed orbit. Whereas to me, he seems, as it were, a moon in a night of storm, whose aspect is frequently obscured and troubled, but which, whenever the clouds break, shows itself serene and holy. If I am right in regarding the Friar as no wandering broken light, but as an orb drawing its normal light from the sun of justice as a saint and hero, then assuredly he should be dealt heroic measure, and Fr. Lucas's elaborate give and take, however honest and scholarly, is so far, inadequate.†

As with Florence, so with Rome, it cannot be said with certainty that Colet ever went there; but it is likely that his first intention was to do so. Or had rumour, truthful in this case, carried to his ears what Baptist Mantuanus has told us about it as it then was?

Vivere qui cupitis, discedite Roma:  
Omnia cum licent, non licet bonum.

\* His memory was accepted as saintly by St. Philip Neri, who had his picture over his prie-dieu with the inscription, "B. Hieron. Savonarola Martyr". St. Catherine of Ricci had recourse to him as her special intercessor with God; and there is a copy of his works now in the Vallicella library "which was given by Blessed Giovenale Ancina to St. Philip, a saint to a saint". Rev. H. I. D. Ryder. *Essays*, p. 74.

† *Ibid.* pp. 77-8.

and so dissuaded him from making the journey? As Mr. Lupton puts it: "Of one thing, at any rate, he could not but have ample evidence wherever his steps were directed in Italy between 1494 and 1497. That was, the mischief done to true religion by the conduct of the occupant of the papal chair, Alexander VI."

Erasmus tells us that Colet, while visiting France and Italy, "like a merchant seeking 'goodly wares', devoted himself entirely to the study of the sacred writers, having previously roamed through literature of every kind with great zest. He found much pleasure in the early writers, Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Jerome, but even more, it would appear, in Dionysius, the so-called Areopagite,\* whose treatises on the spiritual life could not have been written earlier than, say, between 480 and 520, as Erasmus well knew.

Colet's keen interest in the writings of Dionysius is an indication of the quality of his own spiritual life, and, indirectly, of that of Sir Thomas More, whose intimate friend and religious guide he was so soon to become. It is enough to mention the names of a few of these treatises which Colet himself translated, or perhaps we should say paraphrased, in order to bring home to the reader's mind the kind of man he really was, and whom the young More was to follow along the royal way of the Cross. There is the *Heavenly Hierarchy*, the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, the *De Sacramentis Ecclesiae*, that tract *On the Divine Names*, often quoted by St. Thomas Aquinas; not at all, one would think, the kind of spiritual literature to be translated by a man so often held by English writers and historians, to be a herald of a new and Protestant dawn.

Dionysius has been rightly called the mediaeval authority upon the contemplative life. "Starting from the Absolute, he passes through the succession of its descending manifestations, rising (again) in a final ascent to the Absolute in the ecstasy of a mystical union with God."

But, as St. Thomas himself held, the complete Catholic life is both active and passive—passive in the highest that can be received direct from God, active in what is duly given back by man to man. There are four key-words which give us, I think, something of the spiritual secret of Dionysius. The first is the word *Hierarchy*, which expresses the divine law of subordination and mutual dependence of the different ranks of created beings, angels and men. Then there is the word *unity*, with its particular reference to the union of the soul with God. The third word is

\* B. F. Westcott, *Contemporary Review*, art. "Dionysius the Areopagite", May 1867. As the same writer points out, the works of Dionysius are *pseudonymous*, they are not spurious. P. 7.

fellowship, a unity here on earth of men "of all nations, and peoples and tongues" that make up the great common society of Christendom—Christendom, that is, as Colet knew it, as yet undisturbed by the reformation—a unity in thought, in prayer, and in *fellow-work*—work which rightly understood and carried out would provide for all the common necessities of life, bodily and spiritual, and would distribute them always and everywhere to meet the common need, a truly Christian traffic carried on in justice and charity:

... the traffic of Jacob's ladder  
Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross.\*

Counted in the heavenly calculus, it may be that that after his return from Italy Colet's most important achievement was his influence upon the youthful Thomas More, then about twenty; Colet, as we said, being thirty-one. Whether it was at Oxford or not that the two first made acquaintance with each other, it was not long before Colet, a man too sincere to indulge in the exaggeration of flattery, pronounced More to be the one genius he had found among his English friends. Erasmus himself, who tells the story, was not improbably his foreign one, a genius equally remarkable and far-seeing. Indeed, there must have been something very attractive about Colet, and not only attractive but very impressive, an outward dignity and reserve, concealing, as is often the case with Englishmen, a banked-up fire of deep personal affection. As Mr. Lupton happily expresses it, "Colet succeeded in drawing out the *aurea bonitas* of both their natures."

And there is no doubt that More returned Colet's affection, as witness a letter written by More in 1504, the year before his marriage, to Colet, who was away from London at the time.

I was walking up and down the law courts when your servant met me. . . . But when I learned not only that you had not returned, but were not to return for a considerable time, I was dejected. What can be more distressing to me than to be deprived of your most dear society, after being guided by your wise counsels, cheered by your charming familiarity, assured by your earnest sermons, and helped forward by your example, so that I used to obey your very look and nod? With these helps I felt myself strengthened, but without them I seem to languish. . . . What is there in the City to incite to virtue? On the contrary, when one wishes to live well, the life of a city drags one down. . . .

Come back, then, my dear Colet, even for the sake of your (own parish of) Stepney. . . . Come back for the sake of London, your native place which merits your care no less than do your parents. Lastly, though this is but a feeble motive, let your regard for me I have given myself entirely to you, and am awaiting your return full of solicitude.

\* Francis Thompson, *Selected Poems*, "In No Strange Land", p. 131.

Meanwhile, I pass my time with Grocyn, Lincre and our Friend (William) Lilly: the first of whom, as you know, is the director of my life in your absence; the second the master of my studies; the third, my most dear companion. Farewell.\*

More was then twenty-six and Colet twelve years older, and the letter as written in Latin was quite in the manner of the time, when people were less reserved in their expression of genuine feeling.

But Colet was now on the threshold of high preferment, having for six or seven years lectured at Oxford on the Epistles of St. Paul, where he first made acquaintance with Erasmus, since, as Erasmus himself tells us,

some kind providence brought me at that time to the same spot. . . . Though Colet had neither obtained nor sought for any degree in divinity, yet there was no doctor there, either of divinity or law, no abbot or other dignitary, but came to hear him, and often made notes of what he heard. . . . From these sacred occupations he was called back to London by the favour of Henry VII, and made Dean of St. Paul's, in order to rule over the Cathedral of that apostle whose epistles he was so devoted to. And now, as Dean, feeling himself called to a great serious work rather than to an empty honour, Colet restored the decayed discipline of the cathedral body, and began to preach himself at every great feast in his own pulpit, and that not merely on isolated texts, but would begin some connected subject and go through with it to the end in succeeding sermons, as for instance St. Matthew's Gospel, or the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer. His preaching became very popular attracting as listeners most of the prominent people both of the City and of the Court.

Colet delighted in good conversation but was less inclined to the more than bountiful hospitality previously dispensed at the Deanery. He therefore cut down his food allowance, and possibly thereby the quantity of his guests, but not without, as we are told, improving their quality. His appearance, his dress, and his general habit of life were certainly on the ascetic side. His income he left to his steward to be laid out economically; and his own private fortune, a very large one after his father's death, was spent on the new school which he built in St. Paul's Churchyard, although there had previously been a school of sorts within the Cathedral precincts. The new school was a handsome building, with two masters of outstanding ability to look after it. They were well paid and had a private residence of their own. The number of boys admitted was limited, and they were chosen according to character and ability. Colet seems to have thought of everything. Over the high-master's chair there was a finely wrought figure of the Child Jesus, seated in the attitude of

\* Bridgett, *Sir Thomas More*, pp. 46-8 *seriatim*.

teaching, and over it a representation of God the Father, saying, *Hear ye Him*, "an inscription," writes Erasmus, "added at my suggestion".

Colet in his *School Statutes*, which serve as a preface to his "Accidence", prefixes a religious instruction which he called the *Cathechyzon*, including *The Artycles of the Fayth*, followed in his "Rudiments" by *The Seven Sacraments*, *Our Duty to God and our Duty to our Neighbour*, and two of the *Precepts of Lywyng*:

Byleve and trust in chryst Jesu.  
Worship him and his moder Mary.

The *Cathechyzon* ends with a prayer to our Lady:

Sancta Maria, virgo et mater Jesu, age cum filio tuo, ut  
haec schola quotidie proficiat in ipso, utque peuri in eadem  
discant ipsum, at erudiantur in ipso, tandem ut perfect  
filii Dei fiant per ipsum.

and one to our Lord:

Et tu quoque, Jesu benignissime, age cum patre tuo et pater  
nostro, ut gratia sui spiritus nos suos filiolos faciat, sic  
te, Jesu, discere at imitari in hoc saeculo ut una tecum  
feliciter regnemus in futuro. Amen.

It may be noticed that while Colet would have his boys taught "good literature, both laten and greke", he found a place for Christian as well as classical authors such as Lactantius and Prudentius, Juvencus, and Baptist Mantuanus. And here is one last passage of Colet's own, and very characteristic of the man:

All barbarie, all corruption, all laten adulterate, which ignorant blynde folis brought into this worlde, and with the same hat distayned and poysenyd the old laten speche and the varay Romayne tong which in the tyme of Tully and Salust and Virgill and Terence was usid; whiche also saint Jerome and saint Ambrose and saint Austen and many hooly doctors lernyd in theyr tymes,—I say that fylthynesse and all such abusion which the later blynde worlde brought in, which morerathyr may be called blotterature thenne litterature, I utterly abbanыш and exclude out of this schile . . .\*

But Colet had greater cares upon his mind than those of a founder of a new school. He was a great preacher, and perhaps his most famous sermon was the one delivered at the meeting of Convocation on 6 February, 1511-12.

The neglect of religion and the increase of heresy at this

\* Lupton, *Life of Dean Colet*, p. 169. See also an interesting reference to the barbarous sports indulged in by boys in the pre-Coletian period. Pp. 173-5.

period gave cause for great anxiety to the rulers of the Church in England; and so serious were these heretical opinions deemed to be, that Henry VIII ordered the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon a Convocation to meet at St. Paul's in the February of 1511-12 to consider, among other things, how best they could be dealt with, Archbishop Warham asked the Dean of St. Paul's to preach at the opening; and, as Cardinal Gasquet wrote, Colet's sermon delivered on that occasion "is perhaps the most valuable contemporary account of the state of the Church in England".\* And the Cardinal's own summary of it will help us to realize how significant an utterance it was.

Taking for his text the words of St. Paul to the Romans—"Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God"—the learned and uncompromising dean proceeded to speak boldly against "the fashion of secular and worldly living in clerks and priests".

To this secularity of priests' lives dean Colet attributed all the evils which had befallen the Church, and he earnestly begged the English clergy to turn their mind to the reformation of abuses if they would desire to escape the dangers to religion which could be so plainly foreseen. *There was no need for new laws, but those which existed should be put in force.* Ordination should be given only to such as had led pure and holy lives, and the laws against clerics and monks occupying themselves in secular business should be put in force. Also "let the laws be rehearsed", begged the preacher, "that command the personal residence of curates (rectors) in their churches. For of this many evils grow, because all things nowadays are done by vicars and parish priests; yea, and those foolish, also, and unmeet and oftentimes wicked, that seek none other thing in the people than foul lucre, whereof cometh occasion of evil heresies and ill Christianity in the people."

So too, in this respect *bishops should first look to themselves*. They should diligently look after the souls of those committed to them, *and reside in their dioceses*. Their revenues should not be spent on "feasting and banqueting", nor upon "sumptuous apparel and pomps", but in things profitable and necessary to the Church. For when St. Augustine, sometime bishop of England, did ask pope Gregory how that bishops and prelates of England should spend their goods that were the offerings of faithful people, the said pope answered that the goods ought to be divided into four parts, whereof one part ought to be to the bishop and his household, another to his clerks, the third to repair and uphold his tenements, the fourth to the poor people.†

As Mr. Lupton puts it so fairly and squarely, Dean Colet had a real longing to end his days on earth in a monastery.

\* *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*. First edition, Vol. I, p. 25.

† *Ibid* pp. 25-6. Mr. Lupton writes: "With great candour, as well as mastery of his subject, Father Gasquet reviews in detail most of the evils on which Colet dwells. In fact, no better commentary on the sermon could be desired than the examples he quotes in illustration of it." *The Influence of Dean Colet upon the Reformation of the English Church*, p. 33.

The conception of a divine life (the life of the counsels of perfection) which he derived from the *Hierarchies* of Dionysius, seems to have made him place the monk at the summit of . . . (human) existence . . . And in keeping with it is the step which we know Colet to have taken, when the visitations of the plague warned him of the frail tenure of life. He had a lodging (that is to say a house of his own) prepared for him in or adjoining the great monastery of the Carthusians at Shene, near Richmond; and there he was minded, as an oblate to have taken a share in the (liturgical services) of the community, and at the same time to hold intercourse with two or three chosen old friends, of whom, says Erasmus, "I was one". (But) death forestalled him. He had built his nest; but—*sic vos non vobis nesciatis*.

This miniature sketch of Dean Colet has shown us, perhaps, that he was a good Catholic man, and not, as some would have us believe, a forerunner of Protestantism.

I suggested at the beginning that the biographical portraits of Dean Colet and of other undoubtedly Catholic men had been, almost unconsciously perhaps, overlaid with non-Catholic whitewash. Here then, in a very small way, I have tried to remove the whitewash from Dean Colet's portrait, and to show him as he truly was.

And as to the influence of John Colet upon St. Thomas More, the following words, by someone I could never trace, may suggest what in the end it helped to effect:

To Sir Thomas More, sacred things were as vivid and present as a nurse's tale or a judicial reminiscence; but with this difference, that his humour lay on the surface, while in the peaceful depths, where it loved to meditate, his serene grave soul was ever listening to the voice of God, and holding itself ready to reply.

W. E. CAMPBELL.

---

## THE CAMBRIDGE PRELUDE TO 1895

### THE STORY OF THE REMOVAL OF THE BAN ON THE UNIVERSITIES TOLD FROM THE CAMBRIDGE ANGLE

THE Catholic revival in Cambridge may be said, in a sense, to have had its origins in the mountains and villages at Fiji. There, in the years between 1874 and 1877, Baron Anatole von Hügel was winning the hearts of the natives and making the collections which established his reputation as an ethnologist

and eventually led to his Cambridge appointment.\* He was then in his early twenties. He had been educated by private tutors, but from October 1871 to August 1873 had been a Philosopher at Stonyhurst, Bernard Vaughan being then one of the assistant prefects of Philosophers. He had gone to the Pacific on medical advice in order to recuperate from a bad attack of rheumatic fever. His first interest had been ornithology, but after arriving in Fiji from New Zealand, having made the passage in a Wesleyan missionary boat, he turned to archaeology and ethnology. His father, Baron Carl von Hügel, was an Austrian of Rhenish origin, who had had a distinguished and varied career as a soldier, a naturalist, an explorer and a diplomat, and had finally retired to England and settled at Torquay. In his fifties he had married the young and beautiful Elizabeth Farquaharson, a niece of Sir James Outram, and was fifty-nine when Anatole, his second son, was born.

In the autumn of 1883 Anatole von Hügel, at the age of 29, was appointed first curator of the newly established Museum of General and Local Archaeology in Cambridge, now the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. The collections which he had made in Fiji, together with those of his friends Sir Arthur Gordon (later Lord Stanmore) and Alfred Maudslay, were given to the Museum, where they form one of the finest Fijian collections in the world. The care and development of the Museum was von Hügel's life-work in Cambridge, and he figures on the roll of university benefactors.† He became an honorary M.A. of the university and a member of Trinity College.

The Baron was the first Catholic to hold an official position in the university, and without doubt among the first to take a Cambridge degree since James II's time. During Penal Times it had been possible for Catholics to be matriculated, for the tests which at Oxford had precluded Catholics from becoming even undergraduates were at Cambridge exacted only when a degree was taken. Thus Cardinal Acton as a young man had been an undergraduate at Magdalene, where his portrait hangs in the combination-room.‡ But barely had Oxford and Cambridge, by the abolition of the religious tests, thrown open their portals to students of all religions, when in 1867 the Congregation of Propaganda, at the instigation of Cardinal Manning, issued the

\* There are some references to his life in Fiji in A. P. Maudslay's *Life in the Pacific Fifty Years Ago*, Routledge, 1930. His journals of this period are in the possession of Mrs. Lock, of Cambridge, who acted as his secretary from 1920 onwards.

† The notice by A. C. Haddon in *Nature*, 1 September, 1928, assesses his work for the Cambridge Museum.

‡ The original has recently been presented by the Cardinal's great-great-niece, the Hon. Mrs. Douglas Woodruff, to Fisher House.

admonition which placed a general embargo on Catholic frequentation of the two national universities and required a special episcopal sanction to be obtained for any exception to the general rule.

This was fifteen years and more before von Hügel's appointment. What he thought of the embargo before his own experience of Cambridge we do not know. But we can very well guess. Anatole had not the intellectual gifts of his better-known brother, Friedrich, nor did he share the latter's modernistic affinities, but he was a man who combined great piety with a liberal outlook, and he soon became convinced that the policy which kept Catholics from Oxford and Cambridge was detrimental to the best interests of Catholics themselves as well as to those of the Church in England as a whole. He took easily to Cambridge life and made among what he was accustomed to call "the university set" a number of close and lifelong friends, among them Francis Jenkinson, University Librarian, and Henry Jackson, Vice-Master of Trinity. With his distinction of mind and his peculiar personal charm he was himself the best advocate of Catholicism in a university now more tolerant of religious differences than it had been a generation earlier. Von Hügel's university friends at least respected, if they could not understand, a faith and principles unhappily unknown to most of them.

The whole history of Catholicism in Cambridge in the dozen years after 1883 turns around Anatole von Hügel, and up to his death in 1928 he remained its central figure. In this, though he did not command the wide influence of his brother, he served the Church in comparable measure. Through constant ill-health, and amid the pressure of much exacting work for his museum, he laboured unceasingly for Catholicism in the university. When the age of developments began in 1895 all interested parties turned to von Hügel, with his unique local knowledge, for advice and help; and never turned in vain. His correspondence shows the constant calls made upon him in those years for attention to all kinds of questions, large and small alike. The articles of association of Edmund House; Father Nolan's early plans for Chaplaincy activities; the foundation of the Cambridge University Catholic Association; details concerning the lease and domestic arrangements of Benet House, as well as the larger questions of its function and finances; the status of clerics as affiliated students; financial appeals for the Universities Catholic Education Board; negotiations with lawyers, with estate agents, with colleges—all these, and more, came his way in an endless stream. Not only this, but his home at Croft Cottage in the Barton Road became a social centre of great charm and distinction, where a hospitality

which many still remember with affection and gratitude was open to all Catholics. The Baroness, lively, stimulating, charming, was a niece of J. A. Froude, and the devoted collaborator of her husband in all his Catholic works.\*

When the Baron took up his curatorship in 1883 he was able to discover only one other Catholic senior member of the university; only one, that is to say, who retained any link with Cambridge. This was Thomas King, a convert fellow of Jesus, who lived in Cornwall and came to Cambridge once a year, usually for the Jesus audit. King had matriculated at Trinity in 1860 but migrated afterwards to Jesus, where he took his degree in 1864 and was then awarded a fellowship, which he retained until his death in 1903. From 1864 to 1870 he had been a mathematical lecturer at Jesus, and had held various college offices, but since the latter date he had retired to Cornwall, eventually becoming chief inspector of schools in that county. For his services to education he was created a C.B. on his retirement shortly before his death, and he was succeeded on the Cornwall Education Committee by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, who described him as "a fine old fellow". He must have become a Catholic some time after 1871, for conversion before then would have involved the loss of his fellowship. King signed both the Cambridge address to Leo XIII in 1893 and the petition presented to the hierarchy in 1895. He was also present, in 1890, at the celebrations connected with the opening of the new parish church, when he was referred to by one of the speakers as "King by name and kingly by nature".† But for all practical purposes, von Hügel was alone in Cambridge as the sole Catholic senior in residence. Among the undergraduates there was the merest handful of Catholics. "There cannot have been more than six altogether", he wrote in pencil over the typescript version of the reminiscences taken down in shorthand from him by Bullough

\* Von Hügel's papers concerning Catholic affairs in Cambridge from 1894 to 1903 are preserved at Fisher House, and were recently arranged and bound into several volumes by the personal labours of Sir Andrew Ryan, K.B.E., C.M.G. The Baron's own letters are either copies or in draft form. Those addressed to him, coming from a wide range of correspondents, are originals. The whole collection is of great interest for Cambridge Catholic history and throws light on the early history of the Chaplaincy, the C.U.C.A., Edmund House and Benet House in the beginnings of all of which von Hügel was closely concerned. In 1925 the Baron gave orally to Professor Bullough some reminiscences of his early days in Cambridge, and of the course of events there which preceded the decision of Propaganda in 1895. Bullough had this conversation taken down in shorthand and the notes typed. He afterwards himself wrote from these notes a more connected account, which he intended to publish (probably in a C.U.C.A report). This account was then submitted to the Baron, who made some pencil annotations on it. In this article I have drawn largely on the original typescript of the shorthand notes, which I refer to as the Baron's "reminiscences".

† I am indebted to Mr. F. Brittain of Jesus for details about King.

in 1925. The number must have risen slightly during the next few years. In his letter of 1894, which was quoted in the *Memorandum on the Universities Question* presented to the bishops early in the following year, von Hügel said that in over ten years he had been able "to watch more or less closely something like thirty individuals".\* This would work out at rather more than six in residence at a time, reckoning a three-year course for each. Canon Scott's figures given on the same occasion are higher. He put the average number in residence for the ten years before 1894 at fifteen, and said that he himself had known about sixty Catholic undergraduates during that period.†

It is a little surprising that in this discrepancy the Canon's figure should be the higher, since von Hügel stated in his reminiscences that in the early pre-1895 days the Canon had not made the acquaintance of the Catholic undergraduates to any great extent. The number of Cambridge Catholics who signed the petition of 1895, excluding twelve priests, who were almost certainly all converts, was only thirty-five,‡ and when the Fisher Society was founded in October 1895 it had no more than fifteen original members (some of whom are happily still alive), and these included Canon Scott himself and two senior members of the university, von Hügel and Wyatt-Davies. It seems a reasonable conclusion that there were probably not more than a dozen Catholic undergraduates resident at any one moment before 1895, which, assuming an average residence of three years, would mean four freshmen each year; there were probably always one or two foreigners, who were not bound by the admonition of Propaganda. It is worth while remembering that after 1895 the numbers of the Catholic undergraduates at both Oxford and Cambridge did not rise substantially for several years. This is established from the figures in the early reports of the Universities Catholic Education Board (as it then was), and for Cambridge it is further confirmed from the records of the Fisher Society.

Von Hügel's own appointment did not fall within the purview of Propaganda's Admonition. But it was not for that reason any less unwelcome to Cardinal Manning, who asked the Baron if he had seriously thought over the step he had taken in accepting the curatorship and whose manner towards him, so von Hügel recounted later, underwent a distinct change thereafter. From

\* *Memorandum on the Universities Question as affecting Catholics*. Privately printed at the Southwark Press, 1894., p. 10.

† Op. cit., p. 11.

‡ *A List of the Signatories to the Petition on the Universities Question addressed to the English Bishops*. Privately printed at the Southwark Press, 1895.

his own standpoint the Cardinal's opposition was logical and understandable. He clearly feared that any resident senior Catholic member of Oxford or Cambridge holding some official position in the university would become the centre of a Catholic nucleus working for the removal of the restrictions laid down by the Roman decision. This is exactly what occurred at Cambridge. Anatole von Hügel seems never to have had any doubts as to the unwise of Propaganda's decision. From the first he hoped, and worked, and prayed for the day when Catholics might freely come to Oxford and Cambridge without special individual permission from their bishop. The anomalies of the existing state of affairs struck him forcibly, and were further pressed upon his attention by non-Catholic friends when at the instance of one of them he made some enquiries and discovered that only two or three of the Catholic undergraduates in residence had in fact received the required episcopal permission. Most of the bishops would under no circumstances give permission; only two or three were more favourably disposed. There came to the Baron's notice the case of a boy who was taken to Rome by his parents and, his need for a university education having been dilated upon by them to Leo XIII, had been encouraged by the Pope himself to come to Cambridge and be a credit to his university, to the great annoyance of his own bishop, who was strongly opposed to this. A condition of affairs in which dispensations depended upon the personal views of each bishop, and in which the Pope himself could so far forget the decree of Propaganda as to encourage a neglect of its provisions, was highly unsatisfactory. More important, however, was the fact that there was no known instance of a Cambridge career having had a deleterious effect on faith or morals, even in the case of those whom von Hügel would himself have classed as the weaker vessels. On the contrary, the sustained enthusiasm and piety of the Catholic undergraduates in a non-Catholic society made its impression on him, as he claimed that it also did on college tutors.\* Furthermore, Cambridge itself, like Oxford, was changing. During the last thirty years of the nineteenth century far-reaching movements of academic reform and of intellectual and scientific advance were transforming the clerical mid-Victorian University of Whewell into the more modern Cambridge of Montagu Butler, of A. C. Benson and of M. R. James. Anglican monopoly and control were disappearing with the abolition of the religious tests, and with all this there came a more tolerant widening of interests and a broadening of sympathies which made the position of Catholics very different from what it would have been in the

\* See his letter quoted in the *Memorandum*.

sixties, though, at the same time, it also exposed them more to the spirit of indifference and scepticism. All these various circumstances combined to reinforce von Hügel's conviction that, sooner or later, the restrictions on free Catholic access to the universities must be removed; it was only those who—like the great majority of the Catholic hierarchy—had no first-hand knowledge of the circumstances, but argued in a purely *a priori* manner, who could take any other view.

But the Baron's first and immediate concern was for the interests of the few Catholic undergraduates of the day. As Catholics, they were individuals lacking all corporate life, aware of each other's existence only by chance meetings or by seeing each other at Mass in the little church in Union Road where Canon Scott had succeeded Father Quinlivan in 1883. To von Hügel's surprise and disappointment few, if any of them, seemed to have made the personal acquaintance of the Canon despite the latter's warmhearted personality and the wide range of his interests and reading, which would have suited him for dealing with them. There could hardly be any question, however, of a priest being appointed specially for the care of the undergraduates, let alone the establishment of a special Mass-centre for them, for such a course would have seemed to give ecclesiastical recognition to their existence, and Bishop Riddell of Northampton was as strongly opposed as Manning himself to Catholic attendance at the universities. Indeed, the idea of a special place of worship for Catholic undergraduates, elsewhere than at the parish church, did not enter anyone's head for some time, nor did it in fact materialize until four years after the removal of the restrictions, when, in 1899, the Cambridge University Catholic Association rented the rooms in Green Street for the use of Father Nolan. Meanwhile, however, in 1887 von Hügel founded the Church Maintenance Association, a union of Catholic members of the university for the support of the parish church, and it is interesting that it was thought more prudent not to include the word "Catholic" in the name. The C.M.A. was designed by its founder not only to help the parish church, but also to help the undergraduates themselves, by uniting them in a society and bringing them collectively to the notice of the parish priest. It was not an academic society as such, nor was it a social body like the Fisher Society later, or like the Newman Society which was founded in Oxford as early as 1888. The Church Maintenance Association, like its successor, the Cambridge University Catholic Association, had from the start a primarily financial function, whatever wider rôles von Hügel himself may have destined for it in his far-seeing mind's eye.

In 1890 the large new parish church, which had been made possible by the generosity of Mrs. Lyne-Stevens and of the Duke of Norfolk, was opened. Bishop Hedley preached at the ceremony on 15 October, and the C.M.A. apparently made considerable contributions towards the furnishings.

In later years Canon Scott used to maintain that the reason for the large scale on which the new parish church had been conceived was the possibility that one day it would serve for the use of university Catholics and represent Catholicism before the university as well as in the town. Bishop Hedley, though favourable to the frequentation of the universities by Catholics, made no reference to such a possibility in his sermon. But even after the opening of the new church and the foundation of the C.M.A., von Hügel was still exercised by the problem of getting some interest taken in the Catholic undergraduates. Here is the account he gave in his reminiscences:

The question arose of the difficulty of getting the parish priest, who was busy with other work, taking [sic] an interest in the undergraduates. One of the undergraduates came to me and said he had got a brilliant idea. "Our priest is really so much engaged at home and in visiting outside Cambridge that he wants help. Would it not help on matters to get some curate, on condition that the bishop allowed him to come to look after the undergraduates and then be at liberty to help?" So then I had to beard our bishop, Bishop Riddell, who was more against the University than the Cardinal, and that again was quite an amusing interview. Eventually we got a curate, a Scotchman who had hardly left Scotland and had never been about at all. He never went with the undergraduates because he was timid of them. If he saw them he fled into a back street; Bishop Riddell was much amused. He said "I have done my best and it has served you right".

This shy young curate was none other than Father George Page, who was sent to Cambridge in 1892. He remained there until 1899, eventually overcoming his fear of undergraduates. Later he was for many years priest at Wisbech, where he died in 1937.

For years after Cardinal Vaughan and the other bishops had fallen in with the new policy of 1895, Bishop Riddell maintained a hostile and unhelpful attitude towards the problems connected with Catholics at Cambridge. Among the bishops who supported the raising of the prohibition, however, were Bishop Hedley of Newport, a monk of Ampleforth, who exercised considerable influence and was later first chairman of the Universities Catholic Education Board, Bishop Brownlow, a convert old Trinity man, who went to Clifton in 1894, and Bishop Patterson, Manning's convert Auxiliary at Westminster. Von Hügel recalled in his reminiscences that at some date before 1895 Patterson had visited

Canon Scott with the intention of discussing the whole subject, but that in the event he went away without raising it. Patterson saw that ultimately the ban would have to be lifted, but according to von Hügel he was too gentle and tentative a personality to be of any positive assistance in the campaign, and the anecdote of his visit to the Cambridge Rectory seems amply to confirm this. A more powerful ally was the Duke of Norfolk, who seems to have expressed to the Baron, at quite an early date, his strong desire to do something towards providing facilities for university education for the secular clergy. Later on he was as good as his word.

In the early nineties it became clear that the whole university question was entering a new phase. After Manning's death it was plainly impossible for his successor to avoid giving some consideration to the growing volume of opinion in favour of the removal of the restrictions, though there were some who, knowing Vaughan's opinions and the tenacity with which he held them, feared lest any reopening of the question might only result in making the ban absolute. At Cambridge, as at Oxford, the number of Catholics was going up rather than down, and not only were there no disasters to faith or fervour, but there were even some converts. Two of these merit special mention here. In 1891 a Trinity old Etonian was received into the Church. This was Mr. H. C. Norman, whose very great generosity to all Catholic causes in Cambridge from that day to this has been of incalculable assistance to the development of Catholic institutions in the university and especially to the Chaplaincy. It is a pleasure to record here that Mr. Norman's welcome residence in Cambridge during the war enabled him to fill with great suitability the office of President of the Cambridge University Catholic Association, on the retirement of Dr. Rastall in 1911. Two years after Mr. Norman's reception, Catholicism in Cambridge received a further accession of strength in the conversion of Ernest Wyatt-Davies, a brilliant and accomplished historical scholar of the first rank. Had the study of History in Cambridge at that period gained the recognition which it shortly afterwards attained—and which another Catholic, Lord Acton, largely helped to win for it—there is no doubt that Wyatt-Davies would not have spent his academic life in private teaching, but would have enjoyed a fellowship and lectureship at some college. Until his early death in 1907 his lively and attractive personality played a leading part in all Cambridge Catholic affairs.

In 1893 an opportunity presented itself of giving some publicity in the highest ecclesiastical quarters to the fact that

there were Catholic undergraduates in Cambridge. A party was going from England to Rome to take part in the celebration of Leo XIII's episcopal jubilee. Von Hügel, on a sick-bed, was inspired by his wife with the idea of joining the party and taking with him a present for the Holy Father from the community of Catholics at Cambridge University. Wyatt-Davies, newly received, took up the plan with ardour. A meeting of undergraduates and others was immediately held, and in a short time £87 was collected from the few Catholics in residence. The gift chosen was a copy of J. W. Clark's three-volumed *Architectural History of Cambridge University*, printed on hand-made paper and bound by Messrs. Stoakley in a deep red polished morocco, in a design specially chosen by the Baron from an exhibition of mediaeval bindings then being held at Burlington House. The volumes were stamped with the papal arms on one cover and the arms of the university on the other. Permission for the use of the latter was readily granted by the Vice-Chancellor,\* who showed great interest in the project, and encouraged von Hügel to wear academical dress at the audience at which the gift was to be presented. In spite of his poor health von Hügel spared himself no pains in the matter, making repeated journeys to London to see to it; and he received much help from Dr. Jenkinson, the University Librarian. A congratulatory address to the Pope was drafted in English by the Baron and done into Latin by Bishop Hedley, and then submitted for revision to Dr. Jackson, the Vice-Master of Trinity. No revision was required. The address was in the name of the Catholics in Cambridge University—*quot sumus in Academia Cantabrigiensi Catholici*. There were twenty-two signatures. First came those of von Hügel, Wyatt-Davies and King; then two B.A.s, the Hon. Stephen Powys (now Lord Lilford) and E. G. Gardner (afterwards Professor Edmund Gardner); followed by thirteen undergraduates, including Mr. H. C. Norman and one or two others still happily surviving, and finally four names *pro sacerdotio candidati*.†

The volumes were carefully packed in a specially made box which was sealed by the Foreign Office in order to avoid the danger of damage at the customs. Clinging all the time to his precious parcel, von Hügel joined the party, which numbered about 300 and was led by the Duke of Norfolk. On arrival in Rome the seals were broken at the British Embassy and the handsome gift aroused great admiration.

\* The Vice-Chancellor for the academical year 1892-3 was Peile of Christ's.

† I am not clear about the position in the university of th.s: four, two of whom were B.A.s. Only two of them reappear as signatories to the Petition of 1894: the Rev. A. F. Spender (as he had by then become) and W. T. Williams, Esq., B.A., Oxford.

Von Hügel's intention was to appear in academical dress at the papal audience and himself to present the volumes and the address to Leo XIII, with a few words of explanation, when the pontiff came round to him. It was desirable, however, to give some previous warning to Cardinal Vaughan, who was also to be present. At 10 p.m. on the eve of the audience the news of what was afoot was broken to the Cardinal. He was aghast at the notion; stormed up and down the room; roundly forbade the whole proceeding; refused even to look at the books or the address. It took all the Baron's tact and charm to reduce him to something like reasonableness. Finally von Hügel's rueful and almost humorous pleadings effected some mollification. Vaughan saw that he could not simply forbid the whole thing. He consented to allow the presentation on condition that von Hügel said nothing to the Pope, but allowed him, Vaughan, to do the talking. When the moment came Vaughan stood by while the Baron presented the volumes—but remained silent, though the Pope, not unnaturally, paused as if expecting some explanation. Von Hügel, in his strange, unexplained Cambridge M.A. gown and hood, was chagrined and embarrassed. He was, however, later on comforted by Cardinal Merry del Val, who told him that he had behaved admirably, and finally he came away from Rome feeling that he had not by any means been unsuccessful in his purpose of advertising the university problem.

Indeed, on the way back the whole question seems to have been discussed among the party, and the idea of a petition for the removal of the restrictions headed by Bishops Hedley, Brownlow and Patterson appears to have been mooted. But finally it seems to have been settled that the Duke of Norfolk would take some initiative after the party had reached home.\* In the event it was not until June 1894 that a number of the leading Catholic laity met at Norfolk House and decided to petition the bishops to take some action for the withdrawal of the admonition, and also to draw up a Memorandum giving their grounds for this request. Wilfrid Ward and Sidney Parry (both Oxford men) were deputed to draft the Memorandum and were authorized to collect signatures with the help of the Hon. Everard Fielding, an LL.B. of Cambridge, and others. Evidence of the good behaviour of Catholic

\* In the margin of the conclusion of Bullough's typescript account of this incident, written up from his notes of the Baron's reminiscences, the Baron wrote in pencil "and it was settled the Duke of Norfolk, as always prompt and ready,—that he would as soon as possible after our"—and there is no more. All the information about this incident comes from von Hügel's reminiscences. His account of his interview with Vaughan on the night before the audience is detailed and vivid. The volumes and the address were photographed and copies of the photographs, handsomely bound, are preserved at Fisher House and in the University Library.

undergraduates was also to be sought for incorporation into the Memorandum. For this purpose Wilfrid Ward wrote on 18 June to von Hügel, who had evidently not been at the meeting at Norfolk House. The idea of the Memorandum, he said, was "to express to the bishops the feeling of the Catholic laity that Oxford and Cambridge *are* in existing circumstances desirable for their sons. Its object is to strengthen the hands of the bishops who are with us, and ultimately to counteract the Cardinal's efforts to get Rome to promulgate further mandates of exclusion."\* The fear implied in the last phrase seems at the time to have been very general. Von Hügel, however, hardly seems to have shared it, for in the first draft of his reply he wrote somewhat unexpectedly as follows:

I wish that matters had gone differently and allowed the whole question to rest for a while, for it would have been nice if with time the Cardinal had been compelled, by his own observation, to modify his views, and from what I heard that he had said to friends (whose sons or belongings [sic] were at the university) it almost appeared as if that time were not so very far distant. However it's no use crying over spilt milk, and Providence must know what it is about.

In a second draft, however, all this is replaced by "I am afraid that this may not be the best time to urge our claims." But the Baron had no doubts at all about the other aspect of the question — the behaviour and record of the Catholic undergraduates in Cambridge. Though some of them, he wrote, were by no means the most suitable that could have been chosen for the university, even those whom he would in the first instance have advised not to come to Cambridge had suffered no harm. Indeed, in many cases he thought that a university career had helped to strengthen and deepen their faith. "There has not been," he went on, "a case of loss of faith. On the contrary, the conduct of many of our men, I know, has favourably impressed their tutors and has certainly helped to lessen their blindness concerning the Faith."† On 20 July there was a further meeting at Norfolk House, which von Hügel attended, having been invited in a letter of the 13th from the Duke "to meet a few people about this university question". Later he was asked to inquire at Beaumont and Stonyhurst for possible signatories to the Petition, and he also appears to have suggested various additions to the Memorandum, together with his brother Friedrich and Wyatt-Davies. The

\* Ward to von Hügel 18-6-94, in von Hügel MSS.

† This last quotation is taken from the text of the letter as published in the Memorandum. It differs slightly from both the drafts in the von Hügel MSS.

passage referring to the attendance of Catholics at non-Catholic universities on the Continent was probably due to the von Hügels.\*

The belief that the Cardinal, if not badgered too violently, would in time be brought to change his opinions by the mere force of circumstances and by his own observations, was a shrewd one, and revealed a certain insight into Vaughan's character on von Hügel's part. The same idea had not, indeed, been absent from Wilfrid Ward's own mind, though he seems to have considered that a certain amount of active stimulation would be necessary in order to produce the desired conversion. He had talked with Vaughan on the possibility of "a Catholic Mansfield or Pusey House" if Oxford should ever be recognized as safe for Catholics, and hoped, perhaps rather naïvely, that by dint of gentle insinuation the Cardinal might one day come to regard this suggestion, which at first he had regarded with aversion, as his own.† "We must recollect," he wrote, "that though we really want to drive our leaders we must not appear to do so." But the Cardinal was, in fact, slowly preparing himself to accept the inevitable. The leading laymen had recently refused to support a renewal of the Catholic University College scheme that had failed at Kensington, and in July Vaughan had a long talk with the Duke of Norfolk, who told him of the preparations for the petition. "He said he had heard I had had a meeting, that he thought the present state of affairs unsatisfactory and that he would welcome anything that would rectify it, that if the Holy See thought well to change its policy he would be quite willing to concur." He feared, however, lest a change of policy on the university question should be held to imply a change of attitude on the whole question of mixed education such as would prejudice the Catholic case in the matter of public or elementary schools. "I think it of the utmost importance," wrote the Duke to Wilfrid Ward, in consequence, "that your paper should not rest our case on arguments which would mean that Catholics ought to use Eton and Harrow and the unsectarian system in elementary schools." Few, if any, of the laity would have sympathized with such notions.‡

It was part of the greatness of Vaughan's character and a measure of his real selflessness that he knew when the time had come to yield, and that he could not only bring himself to accept, but could thereafter espouse with warmth the very causes to

\* Ward to von Hügel 26-8-94 and 18-9-94, in the von Hügel MSS. Cf. Maisie Ward, *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition*, p. 272.

† Maisie Ward, op. cit., p. 268.

‡ Ibid.

which he had formerly been most violently opposed. It was so in this question of Oxford and Cambridge. The knowledge that the petition was being prepared probably brought to a head a growing conviction in his mind, a conviction which, however distasteful to him—and exactly *how* distasteful we can gauge from the terms of his impressive letter about Oxford and Cambridge written to his nephew in 1891\*—had slowly been gaining ground. On 26 September he communicated to Bishop Hedley his reasons for believing that the bishops ought to take the lead in the university question and “solve it in the only way it will work”. He enclosed a memorandum in which some of the main points later made in the Memorandum of the laity were briefly summarized. With his direct and clear-cut mind Vaughan had finally brought himself to acknowledge the force of the practical arguments against the anomalies and dangers of the existing situation, and had come to see that there was only one practical solution, though it may be doubted whether he ever gave his interior consent to the proposition that a university course at Oxford or Cambridge was intrinsically desirable for Catholics. He was able to carry with him a majority of the bishops. On 4 January, 1895, at a meeting of the hierarchy, it was agreed “by a good majority” to petition the Holy See to remove the prohibition on Oxford and Cambridge, to place the bishops at the head of the movement and to take steps to provide adequate safeguards for Catholic undergraduates. The precise terms in which these safeguards were conceived will be referred to later.

Hence [wrote Vaughan to Hedley, who was not at the meeting], if such be the direction of the Holy See, we are about to embark on a new policy for the Church in England, and though we shall find rocks and shoals, we shall, I doubt not, be entering upon the work that God requires of His Church in this country.†

There were now two petitions afoot, the laity’s petition to the bishops, and the bishops’ petition to Rome. Though the second might seem to do away with the necessity for the first, it was apparently agreed that Vaughan should none the less take the laity’s Petition and Memorandum with him to strengthen his hand when he went to the Holy City. This document had been completed and printed, in a red cover, before the end of 1894, but it is not clear whether it was ever officially presented to the bishops, or whether they had had it before them at their meeting

\* Snead-Cox, *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, ii, 78–9.  
† Op. cit., ii, 81–4.

on 4 January.\* Additional signatures continued to be collected up to 9 February, and the last meeting of the committee was on 12 February. It was no doubt at this meeting that there occurred an incident, described by von Hügel in his reminiscences, which showed how incomplete Vaughan's conversion still was. The Duke and others had written to various friends in Rome on behalf of their petition. Norfolk had been making private representations through Cardinal Rampolla, but he suddenly remembered that he had forgotten to ask Vaughan's permission for this, as he had intended to do. No one offered to go and explain to His Eminence. Von Hügel volunteered.

I got into the room—and a charming greeting: "Do come in. Have you just come to see me or is it about business?" I said, "I am sorry, it is about business, but it won't take a moment. You know our little committee meeting to wind up the affair. . . . The Duke is in a terrible state because you kindly agreed to take something to Rome. We were going to send our view." He was roused: "The little red thing. It is in that drawer, but it would be best if I took it and tore it and threw it in the fire. I am sorry. Of course it is naturally my duty to take it and I shall take it."†

Snead-Cox, however, is no doubt right in saying that once he had made up his mind the Cardinal pressed the matter with energy, and that in Rome his hand was much strengthened by the Petition, though it is evident that no great guns were needed to overcome an opposition that seems hardly to have existed.

The Memorandum was couched in temperate and dignified terms. The authors agreed to eschew all rhetoric and fine writing which might have been suitable in an essay, but which were rightly deemed by Ward out of place in an address which did no more than respectfully lay the opinion of the laity before the bishops. He wrote to his fellow-draftsman Parry: "I think the weight of the document will not depend at all on its being

\* The *Instruction to the Parents, Superiors, and Directors of Catholic Laymen who desire to study in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge*, issued by the whole body of bishops on 1 August, 1896, put the course of events in the following terms.

"The question of the education of Catholics in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge was again re-opened by the Bishops in the autumn of the year 1894, in consequence of altered circumstances, and of a further and prolonged experience. At a Meeting held at the Archbishop's House, on the 4th of January, 1895, it was resolved once more to lay this delicate and anxious subject before the Holy See, with an exhaustive exposition of the reasons for doing so. The leading members of the Catholic laitys on learning that the question had been re-opened by the Hierarchy, addressed to the Bishops a Memorial, which was laid by the Cardinal Archbishop before the Holy See at the same time that he presented the Petition of the Bishops." (The italics are mine.)

† The reminiscences are naturally rather rambling, and it will be noticed that the Baron made no reference to the special matter on which he had offered to beard the Cardinal and suggests that there had been some uncertainty as to whether Vaughan would take the Memorandum or not.

rhetorical. The opinion, its grounds, and the persons holding it are the three things that matter." With "a touch of humour", as his daughter puts it, he went on: "There is a certain difficulty in manipulating the strong language needed, as we must not imply to Bishops only one of whom is a 'Varsity man, that, exceptional circumstances apart, a man can't be of much use to the Catholic Church without having been to Oxford or Cambridge."\* None the less the document opened with a rehearsal of the reasons which, in the opinion of the petitioners, made it impossible for Catholics to play their full part in the life of the country without the advantages of university education, and it was pointed out how great a work had been done for Catholicism by the Oxford converts. The objection that Catholics had got on without Oxford and Cambridge in Penal Times was faced and answered by reference to changed conditions. The Church had always been willing to moderate her objections to "mixed" university education when her own ideals were unattainable, and many relevant instances of continental practice were adduced. The Memorandum went on to say that the dangers to faith and morals in an Oxford or Cambridge course had been shown by the history of those Catholics who had already experienced them to be less than those which had to be faced in the professions—the Law, Medicine and so forth—or in London student life. Here the testimony of von Hügel and Canon Scott was appealed to for Cambridge, and for Oxford that of three Jesuits from St. Aloysius, whose letters were added as an eight-page appendix. Furthermore, the change that had come over Oxford since the active hostile infidelity of the sixties was emphasized strongly. It was explained that no Catholic would be obliged to read for the Classical Honours School with its philosophical course. The History course in Oxford was said to be free from bias and the works of Janssen and Gasquet were known and used. Still less danger, it was maintained, could come from the Schools of Law, Science or English Literature. It was thought that similar considerations applied to Cambridge. The desirability of safeguarding Catholic spiritual and intellectual interests was alluded to, and a reference made to Pusey House and Mansfield College, "both non-residential centres of influence", the success of which was "well worth considering as a precedent". Finally the Memorandum came to its climax in the formal Petition:

We, therefore, earnestly petition your Lordships, to make such representations to Propaganda as may secure the final withdrawal of a general

\* Maisie Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

rule, which is found not to apply to the existing state of things in England, and the consequences of which, if it is continued or pressed, might, if we are right in our opinion, prove most disastrous.

Fifteen signatures followed: Norfolk; Bute; Ripon; Denbigh; Walter J. Kerr, Admiral, R.N.; Clifford; Herries; Russell of Killowen, Lord Chief Justice of England; Anatole von Hügel; B. F. C. Costelloe; J. W. J. Glasson, Bursar of St. John's College, Oxford; T. King, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge; C. Kegan Paul; Richard Ward, and Wilfrid Ward.

A copy of the *List of the Signatories to the Petition on the Universities Question addressed to the English Bishops*, dated 1895 (February) and privately printed, like the Memorandum and Petition itself, at the Southwark Press in Blackfriars Road, exists among the von Hügel papers at Fisher House. It belonged originally to Mr. Oswin Charlton of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, who wrote in 1933 to Bullough that it was, perhaps, unique; "at any rate no other copy could be found by the Baron, who made wide enquiries". There were 436 signatures, comprising those of most of the leading Catholic laity of the day, and including the fifteen names attached to the Petition itself. In addition to private canvassing, signatures had been invited from those whose names were to be found in certain published lists, including "The Graduates of the English Universities". In consequence, the names of some of the clergy appeared, and it was not thought necessary to exclude them, although the movement had been promoted by the laity.\* Altogether between 280 and 285 of the signatories signed as graduates or members of universities. There were 113 from London University, including 43 priests; 114 from Oxford, including 23 priests; 47 from Cambridge, including 12 priests; and a few graduates of Dublin, Rome and Louvain. Others may, perhaps, not have recorded their university status. Among a few clergy without university status was Canon Scott.

On 20 March Vaughan wrote from Rome:

On Tuesday the University question comes on at a General Congregation of Propaganda. I have drawn up the *ponenza* and Galemberti is to be present. I have no doubt about the result.†

Indeed, no opposition, and perhaps only small interest, was displayed by the Roman authorities. On 26 March the Decree of Propaganda was drawn up. It was approved by Leo XIII on 2 April, and communicated to Vaughan in an official letter from Cardinal Ledochowski, the Prefect of Propaganda, dated 17

\* Note appended to the list of signatories.

† Snead-Cox, ii, p. 84.

April. Owing to changed circumstances, the decree ran, and owing to the representations of the English bishops, following upon their January meeting in London, the frequentation of Oxford and Cambridge by Catholic youths might in future be tolerated, there being as yet no Catholic University in England, though the ultimate provision of one was recognized as the true goal to be aimed at. It was to be understood, however, that there was a grave duty imposed on parents to see that no young man went to the university unless he had first had a solid Catholic schooling and knew his religion thoroughly. No boy was to be sent if it appeared that either by nature or previous training he was not fitted to stand the perils of university life. At the same time, certain measures of safeguard suggested by the English bishops were to be taken at the universities themselves. The chief safeguard was to be

that regular courses of lectures should be given by Catholic professors to the Catholic students of the universities on matters of Philosophy, History and Religion, of sufficient scope and solidity as effectively to fortify the minds of the young men against contrary errors.

The bishops were, furthermore, to take common counsel as to other measures necessary for the preservation of the faith of the Catholic students and for promoting Catholic education.

A special committee shall be formed, to include bishops, priests and well-known laymen, whose duty it shall be: to collect money for paying stipends to the professors and supplying other necessary wants; to choose the subjects of the lectures and appoint the professors; and in effect to provide whatever else seems necessary. All the decisions of this committee shall be subject to the scrutiny of the bishops and shall not be put into effect before they have received episcopal approval.

A final paragraph said:

The Catholic young men who shall frequent the aforesaid Protestant universities shall be strictly bound (*omnino teneantur*) to be assiduous in their attendance at the lectures to be given specially for them as directed above, and both their parents and the bishops shall with equal care watch over this matter.\*

I quote at length from this well-known document because it is important to realize that the whole conception of the nature and form of the safeguards considered necessary did not originate from Catholics with first-hand acquaintance of Oxford and Cambridge, and with understanding of the life and mentality of under-

\* My translations from the text of Cardinal Ledochowski's letter.

graduates. It did not come from the laity who had been responsible for the Memorandum, and who had suggested the institution of some sort of Catholic Pusey House as a centre of Catholic life and influence. It was spun, apparently, out of the mind of Vaughan himself, whose decision to place the bishops at the head of the movement had, as it were, stolen a march on the laity, and whose own perhaps somewhat mediaeval views of university life were now drawn upon as the background for the scheme of safeguards which, almost certainly at his own original suggestion, was forwarded by the bishops as a whole to Rome and there adopted by Propaganda without question. Those who knew their Oxford and Cambridge realized fully how little the heads of the vast majority of undergraduates—even fifty years ago—were troubled by the philosophical problems which were the “bugbear” of Vaughan and others of the clergy, and which the somewhat cumbersome machinery of Catholic lecturers was intended to counter. By no means all Oxford men took Greats; the proportion of Catholics would certainly be smaller. All the various difficulties of putting into practice Vaughan’s grandiose lecture scheme—which amounted almost to the institution of a Catholic faculty—were naturally apparent at once to the first members of the Universities Catholic Education Board. It has been by the institution of the university chaplaincies and by the practical devolution on to the chaplain of the onus of providing, as he sees fit, all the safeguards to faith and morals that in the nature of university life it is possible or suitable to provide, including the giving of regular “conferences” on Sundays, that the Board, under the bishops, has in fact carried out the real substance of Vaughan’s aims.\*

The chaplaincies at Oxford and Cambridge are today flourishing centres of Catholic life and worship. The value of the work they have done in the fifty years of their existence is incalculable. But their institution was not specifically contemplated at the outset by the Decree of Propaganda in its terms of reference to the Board, and in practice part of the onus of maintaining them and the task of buying and administering the necessary house properties have, by an inevitable historical process, fallen to local Catholic Associations in the Universities themselves. There are perhaps advantages in this as well as

\* Both Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, ii, 183; and Maisie Ward, *op. cit.*, 274, are, I think, in error in saying that the provision of a Resident Chaplain was envisaged in the Decree of Propaganda. There is no mention of the idea in any source that I have seen until after the Board had been constituted and until the difficulties of Vaughan’s lecture scheme were faced by persons who understood the universities. There is certainly no suggestion of a Chaplaincy in Cardinal Ledochowski’s letter.

disadvantages. By growing up as they have done, along lines largely unplanned and unforeseen, the chaplaincies have come to reflect some of the beneficial administrative illogicalities characteristic of Oxford and Cambridge, whereby, let us hope, they fit all the more naturally into their environment.

OUTRAM EVENNETT.

---



---

## LUMEN DE LUMINE

### A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGICAL USE OF EMANATION-IMAGERY

#### I

NOTHING is more necessary and hardly anything is more dangerous to Christian theology than the use of vivid images drawn from the world revealed to us by our senses. The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, already make it clear to us that we not only may but must use the language of sense-experience and of embodied human life in speaking about God and the things of God. Again and again in the Bible, Divine Revelation is expressed in a rich, concrete and imaginative sense-imagery, and expressed in such a way that we cannot disembody the thought, cannot strip away the image, without sacrificing much of the truth expressed. We may mention as examples Our Lord's words recorded by St. John about the vine and the branches and St. Paul's development of the same theme when he speaks of the Body of Christ; or, again, the great vein of imagery running all through the Scriptures where God is spoken of as Light. The Liturgy and Christian art have taken over, repeated and developed these scriptural images and added others of their own. This is natural enough, for it is only when thought is embodied in this way in sense-images that the arts can express it. You cannot paint a picture of abstract Justice, but you can of the Sun of Justice.

Again following the Scriptures, the Fathers—and in later ages the great preachers and spiritual writers and many of the great theologians, notably St. Bonaventure—have used this sort

of sense-imagery with extreme vigour and fertility; and this, too, is natural, because it is only through images drawn from the world of the senses that it is possible to appeal to the whole man and not simply to an artificially isolated intellect. This use of images, in fact, is necessary because of the very nature of man, who is a true composite unity of body and soul and the bridge between the worlds of spirit and matter. And it is interesting to notice that even those philosophers of the ancient world who made the life of the disembodied intellect their ideal for man, the Platonists, used certain great sense-images, notably those of Light, in such a way that they deeply affected the very essence of their thought.

But though this way of speaking about spiritual things by images is not only allowable but absolutely necessary, it holds very serious dangers. The most obvious is the danger of taking the image too literally, pressing the analogy too far, and so applying the limitations of material things to spiritual being. We are particularly liable to fall into this danger of literalism when we are trying to think about God, the pure and infinite Spirit who transcends both our thought and imagination. The possibilities of error are greatly increased when our natural tendency to an easy, inadequate picture-thinking is reinforced by the influence of a false philosophy. A good modern example of this can be found in that distortion of the doctrine of the Mystical Body against which the Encyclical "Mystici Corporis Christi" warns us, where the true Catholic tradition about Body and Members is perverted under the influence of the "organic" way of thinking which sees People, State or Church as one body in exactly the same sense as a biological organism, and the individual person consequently as a mere cell in the body. The danger of error is even greater when the use of the image by the false philosophy precedes in time its use by the true, for the meaning of a word, phrase, or symbol is always, to a great extent (not entirely), determined by its history, and an image passing from one school of thought to another will almost certainly bring something of its past meaning with it; and if the earlier false philosophy was a materialistic one, in which the image was not meant as an image but as a statement of actual fact, the danger of the image transferred from it leading to a relapse into crudely literal picture-thinking is very real.

The purpose of this article is to make a tentative preliminary inquiry into the history of a very important kind of image used in Catholic theological language, to show where it came from, the dangers it brought with it, and how those dangers were overcome. In the early centuries of our era Pagans, Jews, Gnostics

and Christians very frequently spoke of spiritual or supernatural beings as being related to each other by emanation or radiation. That is, they described one being as related to another, its origin or generator, as light is to the sun, heat to fire, a stream to its source, or breath to the breather. In some systems of thought this language is meant as a literal statement of fact, in others it is used metaphorically, and in many it is difficult to say precisely in which sense it is meant. This language of emanation or radiation is what I propose to discuss here; and it seems desirable to make clear at the beginning that this article does not claim to be a complete account of the whole subject—which would require a very much larger work—and that its conclusions are not put forward as finally satisfactory, but rather as possibly providing a useful starting-point for further study.

Of the various forms of emanation-language just mentioned, the breath-image belongs to a special context of thought and will be discussed separately later. The most important of the others is that of the Sun and its Light. This, like the rest, may be intended literally or symbolically, and may bear a number of different meanings according to its context. A modified form of it is very familiar and sacred to us. When we recite the Nicene Creed we say of Our Lord that He is Light of Light, *Lumen de Lumine, φῶς ἐκ φωτός*, and the phrase seems, and is, a natural and admirable way of expressing a profound truth. But it is rather startling to discover that exactly the same phrase was used by the Manichees of their strange Christ, who was a material light-effluence, and by Plotinus\* of the relationship of the Cosmic Soul to the Divine Mind, which is not at all the same thing as the relationship of Father and Son in the Blessed Trinity. Our problem is to discover the origin of this sort of language and to disentangle its various meanings. In doing so we shall help to show how this sacred and venerable image can be used legitimately and in accordance with the traditional Faith, and perhaps may contribute something to the solution of some still living controversies.

Emanation or radiation-imagery was, of course, by no means the only way in which the relationship between originating and originated divine beings was represented in the first three centuries A.D., and it will be as well to begin by briefly recalling the other methods of expressing the relation. The sexual imagery of the old cosmologies survived in pagan religion and appears in an extremely gross form in the Gnosticism of Valentinus. The superior is also sometimes represented as making the inferior out of pre-existing material. Both sexual generation and making

\* *Enneads*, IV, 3, 17.

appear in the Persian philosophy, which so much affected Gnosticism. At the other end of the scale of thought, in Neo-Pythogorean and Neo-Platonist metaphysic appears an interesting and important development of Aristotelian psychology, the idea that the secondary being "makes itself", actualizes its own potentiality, by contemplating its originator\*; in Plotinus, this idea is combined with that of emanation.†

It seems likely that the prevalence of emanation-imagery in the first centuries of our era was due to the fact that men's minds had been very deeply affected by a type of thinking in which emanation was not intended symbolically at all but was meant as a literal statement of physical fact. There did undoubtedly exist a developing doctrine of physical emanation, produced by the interpenetration of Stoicism and Platonism which began in the first century B.C.; and it would not be easy to show that emanation-imagery was ever used in the Mediterranean world completely outside the very wide sphere of influence of this doctrine. We must, therefore, first give a short account of how this idea of physical emanation grew up in Pagan Greek philosophy. The background of the whole doctrine is to be found in Aristotle's theories about aether, aethereal substance, and what he calls *συμφύτον πνεῦμα*.‡ According to Aristotle, wherever life or sensation or movement of the material by the spiritual is found in the cosmos, the immaterial principle, which is the ultimate cause, acts on the other material things involved through a material instrument which is a member of a group of bodies with very special characteristics. Thus the Unmoved Mover (Aristotle's "God") acts on the Lower Cosmos through the Upper Cosmos, that is the celestial spheres which are made of aether, the quintessence or fifth element. Soul acts on body through the medium of *πνεῦμα*, a substance, akin to aether, which is the material principle of life; it contains *θερμότης ψυχική*, "soul-heat", and can by itself generate life and every grade of soul except the rational. In vision the outside medium is light, which is the actualization of transparency by a substance akin to the aether of the upper cosmos. All sensation is received and transmitted to the heart, the seat of consciousness, by means of *συμφύτον πνεῦμα* (connate pneuma) in the connecting passages and veins. Always, in every process of intercommunication and interaction of material and immaterial, we meet this mysterious group of intermediary substances, aether, pneuma, and the principle of light, whose common characteristic is a special sort of life-giving and creative heat.

\* *Numenius*, V, 25 (Thedinga).

† *Enneads*, II, 4, 5; V, 1, 5; V, 4, 2.

‡ Cf. Dr. A. Peck's Appendix to the Loeb edition of *De Generatione Animalium*.  
Vol. 218

The early Stoics took over this Aristotelian doctrine. But they were materialists in the sense that they were unable to conceive of any sort of substantial reality which was not a body. They therefore gave "pneuma" itself all the qualities and powers of immaterial soul, and even of immanent divinity. They made it rational, the universal principle, not only of life, but of form and order, omnipresent and endowed with the remarkable power of passing through and occupying the same space as other bodies. This "fiery intelligent pneuma" of the Stoics was thought of as diffused throughout the universe, but especially concentrated and manifested in the heavenly bodies which were entirely of its substance and above all in the sun, the Ruling Principle (*hegemonikon*) of the universe, corresponding in the macrocosm to the Reason, the *hegemonikon*, or Ruling Principle, in the microcosm, man. Human souls were parts, real physical parts, of this Divine Pneuma; but, since for the early Stoics pneuma was diffused everywhere throughout the universe, we cannot say that they had a real theory of emanation.

This first appears with the interaction of Stoicism and Platonism which begins in the first century B.C. Platonizing Stoics, like Posidonius of Apamea, and the Stoicized Platonists of whom the chief was Antiochus of Ascalon, stressed the transcendence of the Ruling Principle of the universe; they still thought of it as a material pneuma, but it was for them less of an all-pervading forming-force present in everything, and more of a divine Fire-Reason abiding in the heavenly regions (the difference from the early Stoics is one of emphasis rather than of any formal change of doctrine. The Hymn of Cleanthes and the doctrine of the Sun as *hegemonikon* of the universe already show the beginnings of the idea of transcendence). But Posidonius also departed very considerably from Early Stoic doctrine by adopting the Platonic psychology, making a real and sharp distinction between the reason, the *hegemonikon* in man, and the other parts of the soul (which for the Early Stoics was an indivisible unity). Only the highest part of the soul, the Ruling Reason, was regarded as being part of the substance of the Divine Pneuma in the heavens. Hence a real theory of emanation seems to have developed, according to which the Ruling Principle in man is radiated forth and descends by stages from the Sun and eventually returns to it again, while the source throughout remains undiminished and unchanged.\* This principle of "undiminished giving" is an essential feature of the doctrine, and of the greatest importance in later developments. The next stage in the development of the

\* Cf. Plutarch, *De Facie in Orbe Lunae*, 943 App.; Galen *De Plac.* 643 ff., Mueller; *Macrobius Saturnalia*, I, 23.

doctrine is a remarkable theory which is to be found in a very muddled form in the *Hermetica*\* and also in Philo† and in Plotinus,‡ according to which the Sun, the heavenly bodies, or visible light in general become the intermediaries between the spiritual or intelligible and the physical cosmos, just as the aether-pneuma group of substances were the intermediaries between material and immaterial in Aristotle's system. This theory looks as if it originated in an attempt to reconcile the sort of Platonizing Stoic ideas about the Divine Fire or Pneuma of the heavenly regions which have just been mentioned, with the true Platonic doctrine of a transcendent spiritual world. It plays an important part later in the solar theology of the Emperor Julian.

Plotinus starts from this theory in evolving his very important and influential doctrine of the incorporeality of light. For him, light is an incorporeal *ēvēryēta* or act of the luminous body, closely parallel to Life, the *ēvēryēta* of the soul. It is a manifestation of the spiritual principle of actuality, the *λόγος* or *εἶδος* of the luminary.§ And he even goes so far as to say in one passage|| that light or fire is itself *λόγος* and *εἶδος*, the principle of form in the material world (a doctrine widely held in the Middle Ages, notably by St. Bonaventure). The idea of light as the external act or *ēvēryēta* of the luminary carries with it the idea of *ēvēryēta* as something distinct but not separate, an outflow of the energizing substance, which is the foundation of the view widely held in later paganism that the Supreme God was ineffable, unknowable and utterly transcendent but that the other gods, knowable and accessible to us, were His "powers", diffused through the universe.

It seems likely that this view of light as an incorporeal external act of the luminary, with a very special position in the universe on the frontiers of spirit and matter, had a great deal to do with Plotinus's acceptance of the image of emanation or radiation as a satisfactory description of the relationship between higher and lower spiritual beings. It is because light is for him not simply a body or a physical phenomenon that it is a satisfactory image of spirit; there is a close kinship between spirit and light, not merely an analogical likeness. In Plotinus's use of the emanation-image three important points are very clear: that the source or radiating principle remains unchanged and undiminished (the idea of "undiminished giving" already referred to); that the being which is emanated or radiated is inferior to its

\* XVI, 6 (Scott).

† *De Opificio Mundi*, I, 7, 31; 17, 53 Cohn. *De Spec. Leg.*, V, 67, 18 Cohn.

‡ *Em.*, III, 5, 6; IV, 3, 11.

§ IV, 5, 6-7.

|| I, 6, 3.

source; and that there is a real continuity between radiating source and radiated product. Plotinus uses the image in this way throughout the *Enneads*, but he is too great and acute a thinker always to feel completely satisfied with it, and supplements it and corrects it in very interesting ways.\*

We must now turn to consider a form of the emanation-image which is of great importance for Christian theology. This is the image of the "breath of God", which is very common in the Alexandrian Jewish writings, and which lies behind St. Paul's use of *πνεῦμα*, "spirit", for the highest part of the human personality. It is always worth remembering that for non-Christian and even for some Christian and Jewish writers *πνεῦμα*, or "spiritus", as we have seen, means something material, a special sort of very subtle body endowed with many of the properties which we attribute to spirit, but certainly not spiritual in the sense of immaterial.

We shall now see how the change in the meaning of the word came about. In the Book of Wisdom, an Alexandrian Jewish production, wisdom is described† in emanation-language as a breathed-forth *πνεῦμα* or an *ἀπαγόρωμα*, outshining of God. The language used sometimes suggests contemporary Stoicism, but does not necessarily imply that God or Wisdom are material, and in fact leaves the nature of this Divine Breath or Outshining profoundly mysterious. In fact, though the language is Hellenistic, we are here encountering very ancient Jewish conceptions of the Breath and the Glory of God which go down to the very roots of human thinking, at once linking up with very primitive ideas and foreshadowing the deepest mystery of the Christian Faith.

Philo, in his doctrine of *πνεῦμα*, shows as usual a mixture of Jewish and contemporary Greek ideas. It appears in his writings as an exegesis of Genesis ii, 7. The pneuma, or spirit of man, according to him, is the highest part of the human soul, equivalent to the Reason or Ruling Principle of the Greek philosophers (Philo calls it both *νοῦς* and *ἱγειονικός*, also *λόγος*). This highest part of the soul is breathed into man by God. It is an outflow and even an actual separated portion (*ἀποπνασμα*) of the Divine Substance. But it is not "air set in motion [like the pneuma of Aristotle and the Stoics] but a stamp and impressed likeness of the Divine Power, which Moses calls by its proper name of image".‡ Though Philo's frequent references to the

\* For a full discussion of Plotinus's dealings with the emanation image see Ch. IV of my *Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus*, pp. 49-64.

† 7, 22-8, 1.

‡ *Quod Det. Post. Insid. Soleat*, 80-84; Cf. *Leg. Alleg.* I, 31-2, 35-41; *Festugier, L'Idéal Religieuse des Grecs et l'Évangile*, Excursus B.

human spirit as an "outflow", or "part" of God,\* show the influence of the materialistic Stoic emanation-theory, there are two very important features of his doctrine which are Jewish rather than Greek. The first is the substitution of the idea (which of course comes from Genesis) of a free creative inbreathing of the spirit by God for the Greek idea of automatic, necessary emanation which is found alike in the Stoics and in Plotinus. The second is the idea of the Divine Image (compare the *diavaōpia* of Wisdom), which is of the very greatest importance for Christian theology. For Philo (and here for once Greek and Jewish doctrine come harmoniously together and complete each other in his exposition), it is in virtue of his highest rational part, his spirit or reason or ruling principle which he has received directly from God, that man is God's image, and not in virtue of his lower, animal nature.† Philo's doctrine of spirit is not St. Paul's; it still has too much in it of Stoic materialism, and of course nothing at all of the distinctive truths of Christian revelation about grace, the likeness of Christ, and the Holy Spirit; it lacks, in fact, any idea of the supernatural, as distinct from the spiritual; but it certainly prepared the way for St. Paul's use of *ruōpia* and all the later developments which depend on it.

## II

It was against the background of this widespread theory of emanation that the Christian use of emanation-imagery developed. It is important to remember that the older forms of the idea persisted alongside later developments, and that the peculiar dynamic materialism of the Stoics was still very much a living force as late as the third century A.D. It was particularly influential in Syria, where it probably assimilated and developed more primitive, non-Hellenic ideas. It provided a theology for the Syrian sun-worshippers and deeply influenced the religious ideas of the Mazdean clergy of the scattered Persian communities of Eastern Asia Minor, the "Magusaeans".‡ As a result of this persistence of the older forms of the idea alongside the newer, its influence on Christian theology is very complex. The Alexandrian Jewish form, which, as we have seen, carried with it a good deal of concealed Stoic materialism, was, of course, the most important, but both the Stoic and Platonic forms, and all sorts

\* Cf. besides the above passages *De. Op. Mundi*, 39, 42.

† Cf. *Quis Rerum Div. Heres Sit*, 11-12.

‡ Cf. Bidez-Cumont, *Mages Hellenisés*, II, 0, 8 (p. 142). (Dio Chrysostom Or., 36, 39-60.)

of intermediate variations, might influence Christian thinkers, orthodox and heretical.

The mere use of the image of Light or the Sun for God or Christ, which is universal in the Scriptures, the Liturgy and early Christian literature,\* does not, of course, necessarily carry with it any idea of emanation or radiation. But from the second century onwards we find Christian writers using clear and obvious emanation-imagery when they speak of the relationship of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian and Lactantius all use the image of the Sun and the Ray to describe the generation of the Son from the Father. Tertullian's use of the image is particularly interesting, for Tertullian is perhaps the only Christian materialist, a materialist of the Stoic type who can conceive of nothing real which is not body, and for whom consequently God and the soul are "spiritus" in the Stoic sense of exceptionally fine and subtle matter. He is extremely fond of emanation-imagery,† and uses it in such a way as to bring out all its least desirable aspects. For him the Son is an outflowing portion of the material Divine Substance and is definitely inferior to His Source, the Father. This inferiority of emanated principle to source was, as we have seen, an essential principle of all pagan emanation-theology, and lies behind that tendency in early Christian theology generally known as Subordinationism, of which Tertullian affords some of the most striking examples. Another and much more extreme instance of the deformation of Christian doctrine by the use of the language and ideas of solar emanation is the teaching of the Sabellian heretics, who made the Three Persons of the Trinity simply three aspects of the Divine, likening the Holy Spirit to the heat of the sun, the Son to its light, and the Father to its shape, and holding that the Son was sent to earth and withdrawn again into the Divine Substance like a ray of light—a doctrine of temporary emanation strikingly suggestive of "Posidonian" Stoicism.‡

The School of Alexandria was particularly fond of the imagery of light in all its forms: this is a general characteristic of Alexandrian thought, Jewish and Pagan as well as Christian. The use made of light-imagery by Clement of Alexandria and Origen is Platonic rather than Stoic. They have a very clear perception of the spirituality of God. The influence of Philo is very apparent, especially on the thought of Origen, whose use of the imagery of radiation is extremely interesting. He significantly prefers the word *ἀπανύασμα*, "outshining", to *ἀποπολιά*, "outflow", no doubt

\* Cf. F. X. Dölger *Sol Salutis*, etc.

† Dölger *Antike u. Christentum*, I, 271-290.

‡ Cf. *Apol.*, 21, 10-13.

chiefly because of its use by St. Paul and its suggestion of the doctrine of the Divine Image, but also because it is less materialistic. All things are for him in a sense rays of God's Light. But the Son is a reflection, not only of God's Light, but of the Eternity of that Light, and so is uncreated and eternal, the Divine Image and Outshining in a way in which other spirits are not. Origen is admirably clear about the absolute distinction between the Godhead of the Three Divine Persons and the created being of all other things, and in this lies the greatest difference between him and the Pagan Platonists. None the less, in accordance with the universally accepted principle of the inferiority of Ray to Source, Outshining to Luminary and Image to Original, he makes the Son greatly inferior to the Father and the Holy Ghost to the Son.\* The resulting hierarchy of three subordinated hypostases is in some ways very like that of Plotinus, though it is not at all probable that there is any direct connexion between them.

The great phrase "Light of Light",  $\phi\omega\varsigma \epsilon\kappa \phi\omega\tau\varsigma$ , was, perhaps, used for the first time among orthodox Christians of the Son by Dionysius of Alexandria.† It was also in current use among the Manichees at the time of the Arian controversy. The Manichaean doctrine of the Trinity was a perfect example of materialistic emanation-theology. The Father, according to them, was Light Inaccessible, a vast luminous body situated beyond the heavens. The Son was a ray or effluent of this divine light, abiding by his power in the Sun and his wisdom in the Moon. The Holy Ghost was a further emanation abiding in the air.‡ The orthodox theologians had, it seems probable, since the Sabellian controversy, deliberately preferred the phrase "Light of Light" to the old language about the Sun and the Ray as being less liable to misunderstanding in a Sabellian sense. Now they were faced by Arius and his party with the charge of being Manichees because of their use of this very phrase and also of  $\delta\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\tau\varsigma$ , "consubstantial"; for it seems that the Manichees also used this, the essential key-word of Christian orthodoxy, in their own particular materialistic sense, to show that their Christ-Sun emanation was a real physical part of the Divine Light.§

This accusation by the Arians is the great crisis and turning-point in the history of the Catholic use of emanation-imagery. It was necessary for those who used  $\phi\omega\varsigma \epsilon\kappa \phi\omega\tau\varsigma$  and  $\delta\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\tau\varsigma$  to explain exactly what they meant and to show beyond all possibility of mistake how utterly different the Catholic doctrine

\* *De Principiis*, I, 1, 6; 2, 11; *Hom. on Jeremiah*, IX, 4; *Jerome Epist.*, 124, 2.

† Dölger l. c.

‡ St. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, 20, 6; Dölger l. c.

§ Dölger l. c.

of the Consubstantial Light was from the Manichaean. In doing this, St. Athanasius, and following him St. Hilary, transformed the whole significance of the emanation-image of radiated light, and brought it for the first time into perfect harmony with the Christian Revelation. It was not only a question of refuting the charge of Manichaeism. The image had to be set free completely from its pagan context of thought, in which it was bound up with the idea of diminishing degrees of divinity and always liable to become the vehicle of a concealed Stoic materialism. (The Semi-Arians, according to St. Athanasius, seem to have held the idea that it was possible to be more or less God, to be divine in varying degrees, which is an essential postulate of all pagan Hellenic theology, and is quite incompatible with Christianity.)

We can see very well how the image was transformed if we read the *Orations* of St. Athanasius against the Arians. They are full of emanation-imagery in all its traditional forms. Above all he delights in the image of radiation or outshining as much as any of his predecessors. Again and again he applies the *ἀπανύασμα* of Wisdom and St. Paul to Our Lord. But he sets out deliberately to purge this already traditional imagery of any trace of materialism.\* This he does by insisting on the true meaning of *όμοούσιος* in Christian theological language. This, he says, must not be understood as meaning that the One Divine Substance is materially divided or communicated in part to a separate being. The true doctrine is that the whole Substance of the Godhead is in the Father as radiating, the Son as radiated, so that both are One Godhead. For St. Athanasius the image of the Sun and its Outshining, *ἡλιος-ἀπανύασμα*, means that the Sun and its Radiance, the Father and the Son, are One Light and that the whole Light is in the Radiance as in the Sun. "Both the Outshining and the Sun are equally One Light, One Divine Substance. All the light of the Sun is communicated to His Outshining without sharing, partition or diminution." This is an immense improvement on the earlier Christian use of emanation-imagery. St. Athanasius goes to the heart of the problem and solves it by boldly using all the traditional imagery which had led to so much misunderstanding and transforming its meaning so as to bring it into full accord with the Christian revelation. The two ideas which are found in all pagan and heretical uses of the light-image, and which made it dangerous to Christian thought, are the idea of sharing or partition of the Divine Substance as if it was something material and the idea that the Ray or Outshining is always inferior to the Source of Light. These two ideas St. Athanasius completely eliminates and shows conclusively that it is perfectly

\* Cf. especially the first part of *Oration III.*

possible to use the image in such a way that it implies neither of them. By doing so he secured for this Scriptural and traditional way of speaking about the relationship of the Father and the Son its rightful place in the Catholic theological language of East and West.

This rather remote-seeming discussion of the history of one of the great traditional Christian symbols has a real importance for us today. We still continually use the radiation-image and encounter it in theological writings of all sorts, orthodox and otherwise, and the language we use always affects our thought, sometimes more than we know. We shall, therefore, do well to remember the history of the image and its possible implications of an ancient and very clinging, powerful and pervasive materialism and paganism. We must be very careful not to let it carry our minds beyond the boundaries of its legitimate use: and when we encounter theologies formulated in terms of it we must use as a test and standard in judging them the clearest and most unmistakable statements of the doctrine of Creation (where human souls are concerned) and of the Trinity-in-Unity (where it is a question of the inner life of the Godhead). We can find fully adequate guidance in the writings of the great theologians of the Arian controversy, St. Athanasius and St. Hilary, who follows him closely, and in St. Augustine and St. Bonaventure,\* who use emanation-imagery with the greatest delicacy and the clearest perception of its possible inadequacies and dangers.

A. H. ARMSTRONG.

---

## THE JEWISH QUESTION

FROM the days of her infancy the Church has had to fight a twofold combat: against Jewish pride which begrudges Gentile participation in the Kingdom of Heaven, and against pagan envy which takes offence at Israel's prerogatives. St. Paul himself denounced the people he loved when they showed themselves the "enemies of mankind" and tried to hinder the apostles from preaching salvation to those outside the pale of Israel.†

\* Cf. especially St. Bonaventure *Hexaemeron XI*, perhaps the best and most complete example in Western theological writing of how emanation images should be used.

† 1 Thess. ii, 15f.

But at the same time, alarmed by the growing antagonism within the Church against his people, he raised his voice in warning to the Christians in Rome: "Thou, a wild olive, hast been grafted in among the branches, sharest with them the root and richness of the true olive. That is no reason why thou shouldst boast thyself better than the branches. . . . Thou hast no reason for pride, rather for fear."<sup>\*</sup>

Of these two dangers to the integrity of the Church the second became gradually the more virulent. The first heretic, as far as we know, to be condemned by the Church in Rome (A.D. 144) was Marcion, who was bent upon creating a rift between the Law and the Gospel and setting the Church and Israel irreparably at odds. His intent was born of antipathy to the Jews, who were to him the basest of all peoples; † it was nourished on distaste for the Jewish God, Whom Scripture invests with human passions. The arch-enemy of the Old Testament was blind to the truth that Israel, in her stubbornness and infidelity, stood as a figure of all the nations; that her sins were the sins of Man. Nor would he perceive that the God Who loves and hates, Who repents, deliberates, and takes vengeance, is the ever-present God in Whose sight we stand; that the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament are a promise of the Incarnation.

The heresiarch held that there were no two Testaments, that the Old and New Laws were irreconcilable, ‡ that the Father of Jesus Christ could not be the God of Israel §—the One being clement and merciful, the Good God, and the Other harsh and demanding, the Just God. Neither would he admit Jesus Christ to be the Messias spoken of by the Law and the Prophets; when He came it was not to His own but to strangers. || Marcion thrust aside the Golden Gospel of the Annunciation, the Glad Tidings of the Nativity, the splendor of the Presentation, and the startling account of Christ's first visit to His Father's House—all those narratives of the Holy Childhood which so strikingly display the beauty and the true spirit of Israel. *His* Christ was an unheralded phenomenon—not the Flower of the Old Dispensation, not the divine Answer to Israel's prayers and tears, to her hope and sin. Without roots on earth, without root in Israel, *his* Christ descended upon Capharnaum—in the Galilee of the Gentiles—in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, ¶ to encounter only

\* Rom. ii, 18ff.

† Harnack, in his *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (1923, p. 13), makes an interesting conjecture in regard to Marcion's antagonism. Harnack surmises that Marcion was of a family of proselytes. He may have been one to whom a debt of gratitude is intolerable; hence his resentment against his benefactors.

‡ Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, I, 19; *P.L.*, 2, 267.

§ *Ibid.*, IV, 6; *P.L.*, 2, 368.

|| *Ibid.*, III, 6; *P.L.*, 2, 327-9. Cf. Irenaeus, *C. Haer.*, III, ii, 2; *P.G.*, 7, 881.

¶ *Ibid.*, III, 2; I, 19; IV, 7; *P.L.*, 2, 323; 267; 368.

opposition from the Jews. He came to redeem all men, whereas the Jewish Messias, when he finally appears, will gather only the Jews and restore only the Jewish state.\* Before Marcion's time, no one had fathomed the mystery of Christ—he deemed himself of all men the first to comprehend His message, "so grossly misinterpreted" by His followers, the "protectors of Judaism".† To purge the New Testament of their "errors and falsifications", he excised every reminder of Israel's rôle in the plan of redemption and every allusion to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He, Marcion, was the true Christian; Peter and the other apostles were still "fettered by the Law"‡—half-Judaists, they reflected in their teaching the visage of Judaism.§ They, and those who had expelled him from the Church, stood condemned as "pseudo-apostles and Jewish evangelizers".||

Marcion, teaching that we are saved by *faith* in Jesus Christ, was the "first Protestant".¶ And Luther, another Marcion, also altered Scripture, with his famous addition to the text, "Man is justified by *faith*".\*\* Both discarded tradition as a distortion of true doctrine, which they claimed they were called on to restore. Too steeped as yet in tradition to sever the New Testament from the Old, Luther nevertheless hurled his most bitter attacks against the Jews, denouncing them as "thieves and brigands", "murderers and hounds out for blood", "a heavy burden", "the calamity of our existence", "a pest in our land", "next to Satan, the most cruel and venomous enemy the Christian has".†† He urged that synagogues and Jewish schools be burned, and what did not perish in the flames be strewn with earth; that Jewish homes be demolished; that the Talmud and prayer books be taken away; that rabbis be forbidden to teach under pain of death; that the right of safe conduct be repealed; that the Jews be forbidden to practise usury and their gold and jewels confiscated; and finally, that hard labour be forced upon them.†††

Yet, only twenty years before, the reformer had called the Jews "Christians in *potentia*"§§ and "blood relations of Christ, with whom popes, bishops and monks have dealt as if they were

\* *Ibid.*, III, 21; *P.L.*, 2, 351.

† *Ibid.*, IV, 4; *P.L.*, 2, 366.

† Ibid., IV, 11; *P.L.*, 2, 380.

§ *Ibid.*, V, 3; *P.L.*, 2, 473.

|| *Ibid.*, V, 19; *P.L.*, 2, 520.

¶ Neander was apparently the first to see in Marcion the "dawn of the Protestant spirit" (*Allg. Gesch. d. christl. Religion*, 3rd ed., 1856; Vol. I, p. 254), to which Harnack refers with obvious satisfaction. (Marcion, *Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 1921, p. 231.)

\*\* *Rom.*, iii, 28.

†† "Von den Juden und ihren Luegen" in Luther's *Werke* (Weimar edition), LIII, pp. 502, 520, 530.

††† *Ibid.*, LIII, pp. 523-6.

§§ "Das Magnificat verdeutscht", in *Werke*, VII, p. 600.

dogs".\* The root of this spectacular change was frustration.† His ambition had been to show the impotence of the Church, and his own power, by bringing Israel to Christ. Where all others had laboured in vain, he was to triumph and thus prove the righteousness of his cause. But his dismal failure was not only an ambition thwarted; it was in fact the inner collapse of the new doctrine. He had preached the Pope as Antichrist, but had Antichrist appeared, the Jews would have to be converted, and Christ return. However, in remaining deaf to his plea they took away the props from his argument; they were instrumental in establishing that he was fighting not Antichrist but the true Church. Involuntarily—nay, very much against their will—the “stony-hearted Jews”‡ had become defenders of the faith, champions of the Pope! Their resistance to his blandishments was a sign of his error and sin, and this awareness, long repressed, worked within until it exploded at last in a frenzy of rage. Like a nightmare, that Jewish obduracy clawed and clung, and all his groans could not stifle the mutterings of his defeat.§

The heretical current which seeks to rid man of Israel's legacy, to “emancipate” him from the spiritual influence of the House of Jacob, growing ever more turbulent as time approaches its end, reached its climax with Hitler.|| His hatred of the Jews was his protest against the people who stood at Sinai, appointed

\* “Das Jesus Christus ein geboren Jude sei”, in *Werke*, XI, p. 315.

† It might be questioned that a change had ever occurred, for Luther had never really loved the Jews. Already in a pre-reformation scholium on the Epistle to the Romans, he comments on ii, 28: “. . . sunt odibiles et Deus eos odit, ac per hoc et apostoli et omnes, qui sunt Dei . . .” (*Vorlesung ueber den Roemerbrief*, ed. Ficker, 1908; p. 264.) It is of no great importance that Luther misinterprets “enemies” in a passive sense (an error demonstrated by Th. Zahn in *Der Brief des Hl. Paulus an die Roemer*, 3rd ed., 1925; p. 526f.), but he makes hatred of the Jews one of the criteria for fellowship with God.

‡ Luther's own words are: “Ein Jude oder Judisch Hertz ist so stock, stein, eisen, Teuffel hart.” (*Werke*, LIII, p. 579.)

§ No sooner had Luther seen the abortion of his plan for the conversion of the Jews than he became plagued by a phobia. On various occasions he feared an attempt on his life at their hands. In one instance he speaks of a Jew hired by Catholic bishops to poison him by stealth. But precautions were taken to thwart the designs of this “Roman agent”. Once again, shortly before his death, he speaks of himself as a victim of the people he had come to hate. On his last trip, to the town of his birth, where he intended among other things to preach their expulsion, he contracted a cold. In a letter to his wife he jests that had she been there she “would have laid it to the fault of the Jews or of their God”. And he himself seems to blame their breath. While passing through a village they “blew perhaps so hard at him . . . that his brain almost turned to ice”. (*Luther's Briefe, Sendschreiben, etc.*, ed. De Wette, 1828; Vol. V, p. 784.) For further source material, see R. Lewin, *Luther's Stellung zu den Juden*, 1911 p. 39f. and p. 108.

|| There is not room here to demonstrate the links between Marcion and Luther, Luther and Hitler; but that a kind of “heretical succession” exists could unquestionably be shown; differing, however, from the Apostolic Succession in lacking the glory of continuity. For error is manifold, and truth is one.

by God as herald of the Decalogue; a protest, not against the embodiment of evil that he labelled them, but against a symbol of conscience his soul could not ignore. With the serpent's subtlety he saw lasting marks of her sacred past surviving in the Israel of today, much like the indelible character of Baptism that remains in the apostate from Christianity.\* The Jews, in this an image of the Church, the New Israel, reminded him of a Power above him, a Power he could not move. Like the Church, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, Israel was a challenge—"the apple of God's eye",† an uncrushable people, upon whom so many tyrants had tried their might, in that very act sealing their own doom.

With the instinct of Cain, who struck at grace when he slew his brother, Hitler eyed Israel's unique position, unable to tolerate singularity not his own. For here was a people, singled out by an inexplicable predilection, proclaiming by its very existence that God is pleased to choose the weak; once the bearer of salvation, enriching the world by its default as by its faith; castigated by the prophets and made to feel the anger of the Lord, yet drawing in the hour of its greatest failure words of mercy from the Cross. This people beyond understanding could not but provoke his bitterest resentment.‡ His was a god whose decrees he could determine, whose arm he could guide. And as a sign of his contempt for the God of Israel the very gutters ran with Jewish blood.

But their blood alone did not sate Hitler. He warred not against a nation, but against man as God's creature. Therefore he needed to strip his victims of humanity before he butchered them. Indeed, through all the Christian era Satan has tried to tear down the image of man unveiled by Christ. According to Marcion, man was barred by nature from the knowledge of God—of his God;§ Luther held that in all things spiritual man was like a senseless, even lifeless, statue.|| Marcion said man could not know God save by the Gospel; Luther taught that he could not

\* That spiritual marks endure in Israel despite her unbelief in Christ is the teaching of the Apostle, who declares that "the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance", are irrevocable (Rom. xi, 29). These indelible marks are not to honour Israel, but to honour God, Who chose the people of Israel not for their merit, but for His Love.

† *Zach.* ii, 8.

‡ Hitler is here considered as a symbol, the arm of a heresy wider than his party. It is by no means maintained that he was conscious of these tendencies in detail. This analysis concerns not his personal awareness but the motives of those men who created the movement whose instrument he finally became. And yet he could not have failed to realize them, however momentarily.

§ Tertullian, *op. cit.*, V, 16; *P.L.*, 2, 10-12.

|| *Form. Con. Sol. Decl.*, II, 20. Cf. *Die Bekenntnisse d. evangel. luther. Kirche* (1930; p. 897f.)

make any move towards Him; Hitler, however, himself hindered man from knowing or approaching God.

No longer was man to be *capax Dei*, a creature whose heart is ample for God; no longer to be born to pray or praise, nor to be made for love. Hitler filled his victims systematically with terror and drove them to madness; he made them curse their fathers and defile their names; he burned them with quicklime that they might die in utter agony, trampling each other. He dealt with them not as individuals but as a pile of bodies, a mass of matter to be reduced to ashes.

One cannot treat the Jewish question without recalling these atrocities, whose vast extent and factory-like precision are without precedent in history. Those who have "heard enough", and dislike the reminder, seek only to evade their responsibility. Who among us is bold enough to cushion his conscience with the claim that he did all he could to stay the murderer's arm; who dare say his prayers sufficed to comfort the afflicted?

We must view the deaths of Hitler's victims in the light of the supernatural, however alien and even absurd it may appear to the modern mind. To be sure, the external reasons for his policy of extermination, its "rationalization", were political and economic, but its core was spiritual. Indeed, behind the scenes of every political struggle lie theological promptings.\* Hitler despised man because he despised the Son of Man; he loathed the Jews because he detested the Son of David. Those he murdered may, in a way, be likened to the Holy Innocents; unaware, they too died for Christ. When Herod slew the infants of Bethlehem he sought the blood of the King of the Jews; in slaughtering the Jews of our day, another Herod struck at Christ. The tiny martyrs had not yet believed, nor hoped, nor loved, nor yet fought nor failed; they were born to eternal life, by grace alone. As they were children of grace, may not the victims of this other Herod be children of *mercy*—their very agonies a *De Profundis*? "If thou, O Lord, shouldst mind iniquities, O Lord, who could endure it?"† It is my belief that God will not deny Himself to them, whose affliction was beyond our measure. Although their blood could never redeem them, still it cried to

\* Proudhon writes in *Les Confessions de Révolutionnaire* (ed. 1929; p. 220): "Il est surprenant qu'au fond de notre politique nous trouvions toujours la théologie."

† Ps. cxxix, 3.

the Crucified for His, so that, purified at the foot of the Cross, they might find Him at last. Many who on earth did not hear His Gospel nor truly know His Name may, "the veil of their hearts withdrawn",\* in Purgatory recognize the Saviour. In the Divine Crucible, with all the other suffering souls, they will learn the malice of sin and the wonder of His forgiveness; sharing the sorrows of Christ, they will go in newness of spirit with Him through the stages of His Passion; then will they bewail Israel's great guilt in the rejection of her King and feel in their souls' centre the immense loss of not having known Him. But, please God, they will approach His Glory, trembling with joy and with love; they will exclaim—words the liturgy puts into the mouths of the Holy Innocents—"Our soul has been rescued as a bird from the snare of the fowlers; the snare is broken, and we are set free."†

"Tears are the portion of all peoples and all times. The tears of the Jews, however, weigh heaviest—theirs is the weight of many centuries."‡ But it is not accumulated pain alone which makes their tears drop heavily. They are God's gift—at the same time a sign of election and a means of repentance.§ Israel has greater cause for woe if she no longer wishes to weep. For this reason the survivors seem in worse state than the victims. Hitler may be dead, but his ideas survive in many minds, and his evil spirit haunts many Jews who were spared his tortures. Many of their attitudes are even now indirectly determined by him—a continued reaction to the terrors past. "It is not truth that matters, but six million dead Jews," is an attitude frequently expressed. Many a Jew, unscathed in body, is deeply scarred in soul. He felt the entombment of his fellow-Jews within ghetto walls or behind deadly wire as the imprisonment of all Israel. He himself was the outcast, his sense of security shattered, his own human rights trodden underfoot. Small wonder that so many today are given to vindictiveness. Having been degraded before the eyes of all the world, forced to look on helpless at the torments of their brethren, they seek now to assert themselves, at times in an aggressive manner. Having for so long suffered silently, they

\* From the Good Friday Intercessions.

† Ps. cxxiii, 7.

‡ Leon Bloy, *Le Sang du Peuvre* (1932; p. 208).

§ One school of thought on Jewish theology teaches that the Messianic hopes will not be fulfilled unless Israel, in compunction, draws near to God. Rabbi Eliezer said: "God will raise up over them a king as hard as Haman, and forthwith they will repent and they will be delivered." (*Jer. Ta'anit*, 63rd.)

have now become vocal, and often clamorous. While this we must deplore, dare we condemn those who have succumbed to these only too natural reactions? Can we expect balanced judgements from people so deeply shaken? Their severest judges are indeed those who have not known, nor cared to know, their suffering.

Having lived as one body through the agonies of Dachau and Oswiezim, many Jews of today cannot banish from their memories those frightful images. They intrude upon their minds and crowd upon their every undertaking. And as their persecutors were German, or in German pay, most of them see only the German danger—and the German danger as it *was*. They do not regard the present plight of the German people, but often see that people as they themselves were viewed by Hitler,\* unaware that in this they make vulnerable their souls to his invasion—a conquest against which no weapon avails, save the Sermon on the Mount.

Sholem Asch, the famous Yiddish novelist, is an instance of the prevalent Jewish mind. He has gazed so long on horror that his eyes have been dimmed to true proportion. In his *One Destiny*, he does not blame governments for their failure to arrest the dictator; he does, however, indict the whole Christian world with the “accessory guilt, *if not the full one*”,† for the slaughter of the Jewish people. Although he must have felt his own powerlessness to stem that tide, he accuses the Christians: “It lay in your power to stop him, and yet you were silent.”‡ This charge he makes, not through ill will, but in desperation.

He, with a great number of other Jews, by no means Communists, sympathizes strongly with Soviet Russia, overlooking that in the purge of 1937 most Jews were expelled from high office; that the Soviet Government outlawed Zionism and established its own counter-project in Biro-Bidjan; that no Jewish refugees were admitted at a time when Russia could thus have saved many lives; that “anti-Semitism flared up in the Ural regions, western Siberia and Kazakhstan, where hundreds of thousands of Polish Jews had been deported, following the partition of Poland”§; that the animosity and violence met by returning Ukrainian Jews was condoned by the local government; that no Jew wishing to resettle elsewhere was permitted to leave Soviet territory; and that all Jewish religious and national

\* Mr. Morgenthau's book, *Germany is Our Problem*, seems to be an example of this false thinking. It is neither just nor charitable. One wonders if the author has reflected on the possibility that his book will be used by anti-Semites.

† Op. cit., p. 35. (Italics mine.)

‡ Ibid., p. 68.

§ S. M. Schwarz, “Anti-Semitism in Russia”, *Common Sense*, Aug. 1945.

life within Soviet boundaries was strangled. Notwithstanding such adverse facts, many Jews still consider Soviet Russia their one great friend.\* Her contribution to the defeat of Hitler became in their imagination a Russian triumph alone; her legal condemnation of anti-Semitism appeared to them its elimination. So dread was the reality that confronted them, they are now too faint-hearted to face other truths. The diverse dangers which overhang the Jews drive many of them into a dreamland where life conforms with their needs; harassed by fears, they escape into the arms of a comforting myth.

If Jews today seek consolation in a myth, it is because they feel contempt so keenly. Having awaited for centuries the fulfilment of the prophecy, "And every man shall sit under his vine, and under his fig-tree, and there shall be none to make them afraid,"† yet, still deprived of that serenity and peace, they are peculiarly sensitive to antagonism. Behind the screen of feverish activity, Jews are lonely. Like the invalid at the Pool of Bethesda, stretched so long on his bed of pain near the healing waters, when Christ asks, "Hast thou a mind to recover thy strength?" they can reply only, "Sir, I have no one."‡ Whether a Jew hides behind a mound of wealth, submerges himself in the flood of a mass movement, or dedicates himself to the arts, however genuine his idealism, he is often shielding himself against this loneliness. The Law imposed by God and the persecution imposed by man have both singled him out. And now, having left the shelter of the Ghetto, which despite its degradations provided some protection, he feels in his heart mercilessly exposed. More than most, he experiences the inhospitality of earth, much as the first man must have felt on his expulsion from Paradise. From that day anxiety has been man's companion. Yet in a special way it shadows the souls of Jews.

In too many instances their grief-filled history holds Jews spellbound. Henri Bergson is a moving example of the way persecution has lamed the souls of Jews, making it so very difficult for many to take the final steps towards truth. This noble and candid thinker sought truth all his life; when he found it at last in the Church he could not bring himself to enter her gates, although he never ceased to be drawn to her light. He declined to receive Baptism because it would hurt his brethren, so soon to be wounded unto death. But in his last testament he begged the

\* It is a recurrent anti-Semitic charge that Jews regard only their own interests. In the political field, at least, the opposite seems to hold true. Their choices so often seem to reflect that disastrous decision of the Jewish leaders, when—not knowing what they did—they preferred Caesar to Jesus (John xix, 15).

† Mich. iv, 4.

‡ John v, 6.

Church to bless his body and pray for his soul.\* It does not detract from his greatness as a philosopher, nor does it violate the respect due him, to recognize in the evident incompatibility of these two attitudes a sign of a deep cleavage within the souls of numerous Jews.

Jews are exiles. Their unshielded existence has made them particularly susceptible to all human suffering, and the burden that bows their shoulders seems not theirs alone, but that of all humanity. God promised them the Messias Who would lift this burden, and without this hope they cannot live, so much part of nature has it become. Alas, too often this hope has dwindled to a mere temporal expectation, a humanitarian ideal, a society perfected by ingenuity and struggle, the "city of man", but some semblance of this God-given hope is essential to Jewish existence. Thus even their negation gives testimony to Christ.

This incomplete analysis of the Jewish heart† is in no way intended as an indictment, but rather as a plea for understanding—a plea that Jews may look into their own hearts and that Christians may share their sorrows. As the man who fell among robbers, Israel lies stripped of her dignity, bleeding from many wounds. Many pass by indifferent, some scornful, others satisfied to see God's justice at work. But in the neighbour, bending over the victim, patiently nursing him, God's mercy appears.

Yet a divine visitation Israel's trials are! Once again in our day we see fulfilled the dire prophecies of Moses, threats so comforting to anti-Semites. But wrongly so. The Lord tries those He loves; they are His children on whom He does not spare the rod.

\* "Mes réflexions m'ont amené de plus en plus près du catholicisme, où je vois l'achèvement complet du judaïsme. Je me serais converti, si je n'avais vu se préparer depuis des années (en grande partie, hélas! par la faute d'un certain nombre de juifs entièrement dépourvus de sens moral) la formidable vague d'antisémitisme qui va déferler sur le monde. J'ai voulu rester parmi ceux qui seront demain des persécutés. Mais j'espère qu'un prêtre catholique voudra bien, si le Cardinal Archevêque de Paris l'y autorise, venir dire des prières à mes obsèques. Au cas où cette autorisation ne serait pas accordée, il faudrait s'adresser à un rabbin, mais sans lui cacher, et sans cacher à personne, mon adhésion morale au catholicisme, ainsi que le désir exprimé par moi d'abord d'avoir les prières d'un prêtre catholique . . . ."

This is an extract from Bergson's last testament, dated 8 February, 1937, as quoted by *La Revue de Philosophie*, 1941.

† A psychological discussion of the Jewish question is necessarily contingent. It should be stated explicitly that not every Jew bears these marks, because he is above all a person, nor are these traits in the least racial, that is to say biological, in origin. Many of these reactions are found in other groups, as a particular loneliness among Negroes, or a vengefulness among certain of Germany's neighbours far overreaching any vindictiveness on the part of Jews.

Thou shalt build a house, and shalt not dwell therein. . . . Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, and shalt not enjoy them: because they shall be led into captivity. . . . You shall remain few in numbers, who before were as the stars of heaven for multitude. . . . Neither shalt thou be quiet, even in those nations, nor shall there be any rest for the sole of thy foot. For the Lord will give thee a fearful heart, and languishing eyes, and a soul consumed with pensive ness: And thy life shall be as it were hanging before thee. Thou shalt fear night and day, neither shalt thou trust thy life. In the morning thou shalt say: Who will grant me evening? and at evening: Who will grant me morning? for the fearfulness of thy heart, wherewith thou shalt be terrified, and for those things which thou shalt see with thy eyes.\*

These are dark words, but Moses' exhortation is not without hope, offering as it does life or death, curse or blessing.† And this choice is always before Abraham's children; every Jew at every instant of his life can find healing for his wounds. For God has endowed man's soul with the faculty of restoration, and it is never wanting in His people—God wills their peace.

Peace, however, will not be brought to Israel by mere human designs. Assimilation, once complacently relied upon, has failed—God, permitting the scourge of Hitler, has irrevocably undone this hope. "Strangers, and sojourners with the Lord,"‡ they may not barter their restlessness for a false peace. He will not allow them, whom He chose as His priestly portion, to merge with the nations, lest they fail in their common task to fill the void caused by their defection, and to bless the Christ. To lose her life for Him is Israel's honour and calling, but to give up her identity in pursuit of culture is apostasy. The House of Jacob may not exchange its heritage for a mess of pottage!

A disappointment just as bitter awaits those who pin their hope on Soviet Russia with an almost suicidal mania. The hardship of being Jewish would, in a state-controlled society, become the terror of being no more than a number; the stimulus of distinction, the boredom of uniformity. What a downfall! That Jewishness, once bestowed as a divine privilege, should be considered but a social inconvenience to be shrugged off at all costs! Titus despoiled the Temple, carrying off the Ark together with the seven-branched candlestick. But now Israel is to be deprived of her remaining treasure; the Word of God is to be rooted out and even the last flicker of Judaism extinguished. Never will Moscow solve the Jewish problem. The Lord wants His people to give up shadow for substance, not substance for shadow.

Neither is Zionism the solution. None of compassionate

\* Deut. xxviii, 30, 41, 62, 65-7.

‡ Lev. xxv, 23.

† Deut. xxx, 19.

heart can be deaf to the cries of the "displaced"; none can withhold his admiration for the achievement of those valiant pioneers who have made the desert to bloom, giving the lie to the gloaters over the "decadent Jews"; and no Christian should be blind to the possibility that God may turn their endeavour to His ends and let them find *there* their Damascus. Yet Zionism, pursued as it is with an almost pagan spirit, with the spirit of those who asked of Samuel a king, so as to be like the nations,\* is not the true answer to the lot of the Jew. That lot, however burdensome, is nevertheless weighted with promise. Zionism is not a true answer; when the Lord sent Moses before Pharao to demand, "Let My people go!" it was to sacrifice, to hallow His Name, to prepare themselves for His Word.

It is not the land, however, not the soil, that will restore Israel's integrity. The land God pledged, flowing with milk and honey, is but the shadow of the Great Promise, "filling every living creature with His blessing".† For Christ, Israel was born and is preserved, and He walked through her history in disguise. Before His Incarnation the Son of God was in Abraham's tent in the son miraculously conceived and was offered on the altar in the figure of Isaac the victim. He was at the side of the wrestling Jacob, weakening him so as to prevail over God, signing him, as it were, with the sign of the Cross to mark him for resurrection. In the life of Joseph He limned the events of His own. Out of the Burning Bush He spoke to Moses, and He accompanied His people in the Pillars of Fire and Cloud. Of him David sang and the prophets spoke. He was Israel's Hope and Destiny and, as Simeon said, was to be her Glory.

It is for Christ's sake the Jews are saved again and again. In Egypt they were rescued from the hand of the oppressor by the Paschal Lamb. Thus an old Jewish legend relates a dream of Pharao:

Seated on his royal throne, he lifted up his eyes and saw before him an ancient holding in his hand a shopkeeper's scales. The old man set the scales before Pharao; then he took all the elders of Egypt, her princes and mighty ones, bound them together and placed them on one pan of the balance. On the other, he put a single little lamb. And the little lamb weighed the more. Pharao was astounded at this mighty vision, of a suckling lamb outweighing the great ones of Egypt. And when he awoke, lo, it was only a dream.‡

But it was more than a dream. It was a vision of the Lamb of God, truly Israel's Weight.

\* I Kings viii, 5.

† Ps. cxliv, 16.

‡ *Sefer Ha-yasbar*, 128 a. Cf. Bin Gorion, *Die Sagen der Juden*, Vol. "Mose", p. 36.

As the parallel histories of anti-Christian thought and Israel's persecution indicate, an enigmatic link, never to be broken, binds the Jews to Christ. Their suffering is bound to His Passion. Having rejected the Crucified, they themselves are crucified—the inevitable consequence of their self-injury. They have cut out from their mind the Word, the Meaning of their lives, and from their body, Him Who is their Heart.

The heavens rejoice whenever a Jew returns to Him. The angels exult when he confesses the guilt of his fathers, when he abandons all fear of men, shielding himself no longer behind specious excuses. Not the Jews alone, but also the Romans, were responsible for the Passion and Death of Christ; not only the Jews have rejected Him, the Christian world rejecting Him time and anew. These assertions are true, but of what moment are the sins of the nations to a true Israelite, who knows the manifold transgressions of his people? Indeed, it is an honour in the sight of God to repent of sins.

The sin of the Jewish leaders at the time of Christ was that of secession. Not the Primitive Church, as is usually maintained, left the Synagogue, but the Synagogue withdrew from the Kingdom of Heaven. Segregation, the attitude proper to Israel's long Advent, became, after God's Epiphany, opposed to His plan. It violates the Law of Love and runs contrary to the spirit of universality in Israel, which manifested itself so often during her segregation. The Bible begins, not with the calling of Abraham, but with the creation of Adam, whose clay, according to Hebrew tradition, was taken from the four corners of the earth.\* Abraham himself was promised a blessing for all mankind. And Ruth, the pagan, was taken into the pale of Israel to become the ancestress of David and of David's Son, his Lord. Israel, in God's intent, is an oecumenical people. Its Scriptures are truly catholic. The return, then, to Christ and His Church of any Jew is no desertion; rather the fulfilment of the mission God once entrusted to Israel. It is reunion with patriarchs and prophets.

St. Paul's turning to Christ was not determined at Damascus; the sight of St. Stephen was his decisive hour. Before he met Christ in His Glory he met Him in His Passion in the person of His disciple, praying, forgiving, loving. Unless the Jews meet Christ first in the Christian, how can they leap the barriers of their prejudice? Priests, nuns and layfolk of many European countries have written a glorious page of Church history, radiating Christ by their acts of merciful love towards their agonized brethren,

\* II Enoch xxx, 13.

the Jews, at the risk of their own lives. Their example cannot but bear everlasting fruit.

There are other instances, however, treacherous to the spirit of Christ, which threaten to mar the page. To mention one. In Argentina police looked on while Jews were beaten; a Catholic nationalist defended the movement responsible for these anti-Jewish riots with the blasphemous remark that Christ Himself was a Dictator. Another wrote, at the time when the heart-rending slaughter of European Jews began:

If we do not wish to see the name of God proscribed, our temples burned, our priests reviled, our virgins violated by the rabble, it may be necessary to gird our loins and clutch the sword. If through sentimentality or cowardice we refuse to fight intrepidly, we shall have to live slaves of a mad minority of Jews, who after reviling that which is most sacred to us will subject us to the tyranny of dishonour.\*

This statement is void of truth and justice. Whither is compassion gone, that distinction of Christ's disciple?

In the anti-Semitism found among Christians the spirit of Marcion and Luther lives again. When the heresiarch demanded of St. Polycarp, "Recognize us!" he was answered, "I do. I recognize the first-born of satan."† In like manner, Pius XI unmasked anti-Semitism, declaring it incompatible with the sublime reality of our sacred relationship with Abraham; inadmissible, because of our spiritual descendancy from the Patriarch through Christ. Anti-Semitism is a heresy, a sin not only against justice and charity but also against faith. It offends, in fact, against faith in a double sense, denying at least implicitly many truths of revelation, and smothering the spark of belief in the hearts of many who are Christ's brethren according to the flesh.

When the great Pope spoke of our kinship with Abraham, he used, not the religious terms "Israelites" or "children of Israel", but the now derogatory "Semites", to make us one with the persecuted, seeking by this identification to console their misery, and he wept, feeling their pain as his own. His spirit was that of Isaias, who, beholding the future as present, cried out: "Comfort ye! Comfort ye, my people! saith your God. Speak ye to Jerusalem, and call unto her, for her slavery has come to an end, her iniquity is forgiven: she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."‡

\* Julio Meinvielle, *El Judio*, 2nd ed., 1940, pp. 148-9. In this book, filled with false statements, the Jews are constantly referred to as "children of the devil" (p. 142), and Moscow is called "headquarters of Judaism" (p. 143).

† Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV, 14, 7; *P.G.*, 20, 340.

‡ Isaias xl, 1, 2.

The Jewish question is a question indeed; but not one of the economic or political order—at least, not primarily. First and foremost, it is a religious question, a mystery of faith, God's own query. For unto the end of time God asks of the Jews faith in Christ, and of the Christians love.

H. S. OESTERREICHER.\*

---

---

## REFLECTIONS ON MEDIAEVAL CLERICAL TAXATION

THE taxation of clerics by the civil power constituted one of the most thorny problems in the later Middle Ages. No other item of practical and theoretical politics was apt to arouse so much heat, violence of argument and hostility between the contesting parties as this vexatious problem. The harmony between Church and State, so earnestly desired by both Pope and Emperor, was easily and, one might be tempted to say, frivolously jeopardized, once this problem became an issue of practical politics. Individual thinkers were always liable to go to extremes and to cross swords with their opponents, frequently propounding their views with unrestrained emotional fervour rather than with rational arguments. The refusal by the Pope and his adherents to meet the ever-growing demands of the secular State and its partisans inflamed the passions, and eventually the struggle reached its culmination in the memorable conflict between Boniface VIII and Philip IV of France. The assumption cannot lightly be dismissed that the controversy, though outwardly appearing as a purely political argument, represented a duel between the parties, in which the one was eager to prove the indisputable justness of clerical taxation, whilst the other emphatically denied every foundation for this claim. The true object of this duel can easily be misunderstood, as the argument concerning taxes was sometimes carefully and skilfully tucked away, so that the very name of *tributa* did not even appear, or it was given a rather

\* Father Oesterreicher is a convert from the Jewish faith.

inconspicuous place and position. Nevertheless, the only practical conclusion which a contemporary reader could draw from a perusal of the controversial writings, was inescapable, i.e. that the civil authority was fully justified in its claim for taxation, or, reading the tracts of the papal adherents, that this claim was completely unfounded. Of the more important political treatises vigorously representing the secular argument may be mentioned the document written by the Masters of the University of Paris and entitled *Rex Pacificus* (1301 or 1302), the tract *De Potestate Regia et Papali*, by John of Paris (1303), and the anonymous *Quaestio in Utramque Partem*; whilst the counter-argument embodying a spirited attack on the claims of the secular power was best put forward by Egidius Romanus in his *De Ecclesiastica Potestate* (1302), by James of Viterbo's *De Regino Christiano* and, a few years later, by Augustinus Triumphus (1308).

It is not difficult to understand the intrinsic reason for the basic claim and its gradual extension made by the State towards the Church, or for the defensive attitude of the Church, which is also reflected in papal Bulls. The wars waged by emperors and kings, and internal strifes within the State, imposed very heavy obligations on public expense; not only in an individual case might one belligerent have actually lost territory, but the territory which still remained in his possession might have considerably suffered by the war, so that important sources of income came to be lost. On the other hand, even the resources of a victorious party were drained to such an extent, especially in long-drawn-out quarrels, that the actual victory merely entailed problems of another kind; that is to say, problems of how to meet the financial aftermath of the war. Nor is this all. The idea of centralization, first inaugurated by Frederick II's Sicilian enterprise, did not fail to appeal to other reforming zealots, especially to the rulers of France in the fourteenth century. The realization of this idea necessarily meant a growth in the number of officials, paid out of public revenues and charged with the execution of affairs henceforward under the control of the State. A growing tendency on the part of the State to concern itself with matters which hitherto did not belong to it, such as schools, universities, erection of public buildings, bridges, and so on, contributed further to the increase of State expenditure. In short, the tendency of the State to widen its field of activity and to assume a position which it had not occupied previously, is clearly recognizable. The efforts of the secular authorities to create new sources of income are therefore understandable.

The possessions of the Church, clerics and ecclesiastical corporations formed a welcome target in the State's efforts to

fill depleted coffers. Yet a serious obstacle presented itself in the principle—formally recognized by the civil authority, though not always interpreted in the appropriate spirit—that the liberty of the Church and clerics must not be curtailed by human legislation. "Sancta Mater Ecclesia humanis legibus non restringitur" was an axiom the truth of which nobody dared to impugn. And the imposition of taxes and other civic duties upon the Church and clerics would certainly have amounted to a curtailment of the stipulated and axiomatic freedom of the Church. The demand of the State against the Church to contribute to the public expenses was consequently sharply refused, with particular emphasis on this principle. Nevertheless, in practice the secular power did not abandon the struggle, nor did their partisans become weary of putting forward the conception of the ruler's *plenitudo potestatis*, based upon Christ's dictum, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's", an utterance which became, in the hands of zealots, a pliable instrument with which to justify their exalted claims. With this conception in view, these adherents of the omnipotence of the State maintained that the civil authority had a right to enforce the discharge of tax duties and any other civic obligations from the Church and clerics. We have not far to look for the target of the secular policy: the Church and individual clerics not only possessed large estates, but their wealth was being continually increased by gifts from the propertied classes. All this landed property—as well as other goods and moveables—were, by law, exempted from any tax. It was this immunity which became the bone of contention between Church and State. Secular legislation aiming at the abolition of this immunity was immediately challenged by the clerical authority, and branded as an encroachment and a violation of the old and well-established principle of the freedom of the Church.

We find the first reactions of the Church towards the pretensions of the secular power in numerous provincial synods. They all threatened with excommunication the individual who ordered the taxation of clerical possessions, and the whole community and territory with an interdict, if satisfaction was not given within a certain period, usually six months. This was, for instance, stipulated in an article of the synod held at Cologne in 1266; a similar regulation was contained in one of the sixty-nine articles of the Hungarian synod at Ofen in 1279; the synod held at Bremen, 1292, threatened with excommunication all those who "touch" clerical property. These examples could easily be multiplied.\* But the struggle came to a head when Boniface VIII

\* For further examples see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Vol. VI, Part I, pp. 248ff. and *passim*.

issued his famous Bull *Clericis Laicos* on 25 February, 1296, addressed by implication to the French and English kings. Here again the immunity of Church property was laid down as a fundamental right.

The struggle which now ensued marked the climax in the whole history of clerical taxation. In the course of the fourteenth century the dispute became less heated, pamphleteers were almost wholly engaged in taking sides either for John XXII or Lewis of Bavaria, and in the second half of the century this once vexatious problem did not seem to have constituted more than a point of academic interest. To judge from contemporary writings, a more or less clearly shaped policy as regards taxation of clerics had emerged. At least in this respect the relations between Church and State appeared to have become settled and fixed. A study of the provincial synods held in the fourteenth century goes to prove the small topical interest in this question. More than that: we even find expressed an implicit recognition by some synods of an apparently established policy pursued by the State. The synod of Angers, 1365, contains in its twenty-eighth chapter the significant regulation that *new* taxes should not be levied upon ecclesiastical property; the synod considered those taxes as new "quorum impositio seu exactio memoriam hominum non extat". Another synod, held at Tarragona, 1369, laid down that secular officials must not use force when collecting taxes from clerical persons. This change of temper is noteworthy.

The question now arises, how was this change of policy made possible? And what change had in fact taken place? The answer to these questions is not to be looked for in any altered political structure in the fourteenth century, but solely in the influence which the flourishing schools of law at the various universities, notably Bologna, Pavia, Padua and Siena, exerted, through a considerable number of years, upon generations of lawyers, civilian and canonistic alike. A decision as to the theoretical justification of taxes and any other civic duties cannot be reached by heated, emotional, irrational disputation, leaving aside the dictates of cool and sober reasoning. They are matters to be discussed, considered and decided, not in the somewhat explosive atmosphere of political commotion, but only from a detached and dispassionate standpoint, by investigating on a rational plane the pertinent foundations of the claims made. The law schools were the ideal forum for deciding the controversy. Though the law which the professors expounded to their disciples was the Roman law in the shape of Justinian's codification, the conditions of its application had, in the course of eight centuries, altered considerably. These scholars perceived their main task

to be the exposition of a theory of law which, though based upon the principles inherent in Roman law, nevertheless took the existing social and political realities into account. In the terminology of the fourteenth century, legal scholarship was a far wider concept than it is held to be today; it comprised not only the science of law proper, but also departments which in modern times would come under the heading of sociology, economics and politics. We may well attempt to sketch briefly the system of taxation as far as it concerned the Church, clerics and ecclesiastical corporations. But we must be on our guard lest we assume that they had established a fully fledged theory of taxation, comparable to modern ones; in that age of feudalism only embryonic germs of a theory of taxation and civic obligation can be discovered.

There are several reasons why the professors, though keeping aloof from the turmoil of practical politics, were prompted to declare themselves on this troublesome question. Two principles stood at the bottom of their considerations. On the one hand, it was axiomatic that every citizen was under a legal obligation to pay taxes and to render any other civic duties which the legitimate civil authority might demand from him. On the other hand, as we have already observed, it was an equally axiomatic principle that the property of the Church and clerics was exempted from any tax. Naturally, the civic burdens imposed upon the lay population increased proportionately as the property of the Church and clerics increased. Having to meet the public expenses, the civil power was bound to shift taxes and other civic duties upon lay individuals. These now, in their turn, were anxious to evade an increase of taxes, and, however paradoxical it may sound, it was that second principle which opened to them the possibility of escaping tax duties. For it was soon found out that in some districts fictitious bargains were concluded between lay individuals and a Church or a cleric to the effect that lay individuals transferred their landed property to the cleric and thus secured immunity from the land tax. Another way of circumventing the payment of the land tax was to enter an order fictitiously and hence to obtain exemption. That the public finances were bound to suffer seriously by such fictitious transactions is easily understood. It cannot surprise us, then, when we read in a lecture of the great Bartolus that no taxable property was left in certain States, "quia ecclesiae et clericorum tantum excrescebant in divitiis, quod possessiones non remanebant ad onera subeunda civitatis".\* Bartolus did not dwell upon the point whether the increase in ecclesiastical wealth was fictitious or real, but he hastened to add

\* Bartolus in his lecture on the *Digestum Novum*, fol. 236.

the significant and apologetic remark: "Praedicta dico salva correctione et determinatione sanctae matris ecclesiae, quia si aliud determinat, et ego aliter determino." And the study of the writings of other jurists merely corroborates the statement of Bartolus. Already Odofredus, a leading jurist of the older generation, had drawn attention to the growing tendency of the civil population to hand over, fictitiously or really, their landed property to clerics, and thus deprived the State of an important source of income. The remedy which was commonly proposed seems to meet the requirements of fairness, justice and equity; nor did the suggested remedy infringe upon the inviolability of Church property. They taught that in order to avoid the loss of revenue the legislator would act within the ambit of his legitimate sphere when he declared all landed property within a certain province taxable as from a certain date: a transfer of property later could not affect the obligation which rested upon the estate as such, regardless of the character of its owner. The juristic justification of this procedure was found in the idea that land taxes were *tributa realia*; that is to say, taxes for which the land itself was "immediate causa impositionis", no matter what privileged position its owner might have. In technical language, the land tax was constructed as a *jus in rem*, as a right of the State available against everyone, without exception. The rules governing the land taxes consequently followed the principles relating to things independent of the personality of the owner. Thus, land tax was payable for the estate "ad quemcumque perveniat". As Baldus, the great disciple of Bartolus, expressed it, the land tax was to be paid also by the Church "ad quam vadit res tributaria", no matter whether a cleric had acquired the particular estate by reason of a last will or by way of a donation or purchase. In this way the fundamental principle of the inviolability of ecclesiastical property was saved, and the State was no more left to the mercy of individual landowners. It is plain, the professors pointed out, that legislative measures of this kind could not be retrospective, but only prospective.

The amount to be paid as land tax was computed on the basis of a system of quotas, usually amounting to about one-tenth of the proceeds of the estate. But it was strongly emphasized by the scholars—and this is a cardinal tenet of their system of taxes—that the State had no means of enforcing the discharge of this duty imposed upon clerics or the Church. All jurists agreed that any action by which the payment of this land tax was to be enforced would violate the principle of ecclesiastical liberty. Neglect on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities to pay this land tax did not lead to the loss or confiscation of the taxable property, for it

was still thought that "in tributis ecclesia est privilegiata".\* Enforcement, or attempted enforcement, entailed excommunication on the part of the State officials and their life-long deportation.

Another tax under the heading of *tributum reale* was the so-called *collecta*. As a matter of principle, the ecclesiastical authorities were under the same obligation as regards this tax—a kind of income tax—as they were in respect of the land tax. It should be pointed out that every civic obligation which did not consist in some personal services was considered a *tributum reale*, and hence the "income tax", too, fell under this heading. In other words, the land tax concerned immobile goods, whereas the "income tax" was a tax which was levied upon moveables. Here, too, the actual amount depended on the quota fixed by the secular authority. Exemplifying this kind of tax, Odofredus said that the statute might run: "Quilibet, qui habet centum, praestat quinque."† The restriction that the secular authority must not resort to an enforcement of this tax was also valid in this respect.

We may now legitimately ask which secular authority was empowered to levy taxes. Bartolus, as usual excelling his colleagues in political wisdom and foresight, investigated this problem, and arrived at the conclusion that the only lawful authority, apart from the Emperor as the supreme law-giver, was that body politic which was entrusted with legislation. To be valid, the tax imposing law had to come from an independent body politic. Thus kings and dukes in their domains, as well as "civitates non pedisseque"—that is, independent city-States—were entitled to issue valid tax laws. Autonomous communes, such as the republics in northern Italy, which had gained their independence by the Treaty of Constance, 1183, and other autonomous municipalities, must be reckoned amongst those bodies which enjoyed independent legislation. Barons as mere owners of castles, the feudal lords of the manors, corporations and communities, were legally not in a position to impose taxes.

Thus we can see that the unyielding and uncompromising attitude formerly characterizing the position of the contestants, and thereby engendering so much heat and excitement, gave way to a more conciliatory temper. The efforts made by the scholars to reach a compromise were accepted more readily, as man had been prepared ideologically, by a slow and hardly perceptible process. The spreading of the principles embodied in Roman law, through the training of generations of lawyers, necessarily entailed the unquestioned acceptance of the ideological founda-

\* Bartolus in his lecture on the *Codex*, fol. 11 *verso* (C. i, 2, 5).

† Lecture on the *Codex*, fol. 8 *verso*.

tions upon which the imposing edifice of Roman law rested. One of these ideological foundations was the concept of "publica utilitas". It was this idea which called for a revision of opinion concerning clerical taxation, the idea namely that the civil authority had a moral right to ask for contributions from the Church and clerics: it was in the public interest that they contributed to the public expenses, since they themselves were considered to enjoy the protection of their possessions by the civil authority. In its vagueness, flexibility and adaptability this idea could not fail to appeal to the imagination of man.

We may now turn to a brief consideration of other categories of taxes and civic duties, not all of which were thought to lie within the purview of the State's moral right to demand them from the Church and clerics. To these other taxes belonged, above all, the so-called *tributa personalia*; that is, civic duties which consisted in purely personal services, or, as the jurists expressed it, for which "persona est immediate causa impositionis". In other words, *tributa personalia* excluded the payment in kind or money. Those who were appointed as a tutor of minors or other persons in need of guardianship, or were appointed as a syndic of a corporation, as a judge, as an ambassador, or as a guard of some special locality, and the like, were bound to fulfil such obligation as arose out of their appointments. From all these personal duties the clergy were exempted, whether the duties were remunerative or not.

Nevertheless, certain personal duties were styled honorary obligations. Theory and practice considered their discharge by members of the clergy as lying within the ambit of the permissible. Innocent IV had pointed out that the Church and clerics underwent those personal duties which were prescribed in the case of the arrival of the Emperor ("in adventu principis").\* Such duties consisted in the provision of sleeping-quarters for the Emperor's suite, in the contribution of food and drink for them, and also in providing carts for the conveyance of the Emperor's personnel. These honorary duties were later extended so as to comprise also the extraordinary taxes imposed upon the population by reason of the birth of an heir. It was left to the individual cleric to decide whether he would undertake these duties, but, to judge from the wording of Innocent IV's passage, it seems that he had expected them to fulfil these duties. The commentaries of the civilian professors, too, go to prove that the clerics should not shirk these obligations, although no enforcement was permitted.

The clerics were, however, obliged to contribute to the

\* See his commentaries on the *Decretals*, iv, 49, 4, fol. 459 *verso*.

maintenance of bridges, roads, highways, city towers, and the like. On this point, too, there was unanimous agreement amongst the scholars that the costs for repairs must be borne by the Church and clerics. This duty was not to be imposed if the bridge, road, etc., merely led to a church without any landed property attached to it. Consequently, the churches of the mendicant friars were exempt from this duty. This was the doctrine of Jacobus Butrigarius, later to be adopted by all jurists. The erection of town walls formed another item of civic obligation, from which clerics could not withdraw. However, a distinction was made: if the erection of the city walls was merely carried out "ad ornatum civitatis", the clerics were free, but if the walls had to be erected by reason of the threat of a war, the clerics were not considered exempted. But Baldus maintained, and it seems that his view was not isolated, that enforcement of all these duties could be effected by the Bishop, though not by the civil authority. This duty did not mean, however, that the clerics had to offer their manual services for the construction and repairs of these buildings, roads, and the like. To demand these manual labours from them would have amounted to asking them to carry out a "munus sordidum", i.e. a menial task from which they were exempted altogether. But they were considered liable to contribute to the building expenses by paying a certain amount of money. This appears to have been first expressed by Cynus de Pistoja, who said that "in solvenda pecunia, ut muri fiant" cannot be seen anything contrary to the privileged position of the Church and clerics, though their services in "ipsa fabricatura" must not be asked for. This same scholar pointed also to the justification of these duties: it was, he said, in the public interest that bridges, etc., be kept intact, because they were the only means by which the State and the population could be supplied with food; and city walls were measures of defence against an enemy, and thus their construction also lay in the public interest. This consideration of the public interest was put forward with an ever greater insistence; the principle secured itself an ever widening basis for the decision of controversial points. Accordingly, all the duties which we have just enumerated, were lumped together under the convenient and somewhat elusive general conception that a "communis rei publicae necessitas" called for them.\*

Once this general idea of the public interest had established itself in the minds of mediaeval men, it was bound to prove itself capable of further application and of being employed to an ever-growing extent. In the course of the fourteenth century we see

\* Baldus in his commentary on the Treaty of Constance, col. 163.

another civic obligation imposed upon the Church and clerics. They were considered liable to the so-called cart tax, which, in effect, was a customs duty. This tax was levied on the assumption that carts and coaches wear out the public roads, which needed continual repairs to keep up the smooth traffic between the various cities and States. Those whose vehicles used public roads should, therefore, contribute to their maintenance. Baldus stated that "plaustra destruunt civitatem et vias, et oportet quod quotidie reficiantur viae ex illa pecunia, et ideo sicut ad refectionem viae tenentur (scil. ecclesiae), ita ad solutionem illius gabellae, ex qua reficitur via." This tax was consequently additional to the general obligation to contribute to the maintenance of roads and highways; it concerned only the owners of vehicles using public thoroughfares.

On the other hand, there was unanimous agreement that the Church and clerics were not liable to any *munera sordida*, which, as a rule, were *munera personalia*, and thus demanded personal or corporeal services. To these menial tasks belonged the duty of other citizens to clean public roads, squares, etc., to carry out ordinary guard duties, to char wood or bake bricks, to slake chalk, to carry building material to the sites, and the like. Furthermore, clerics were granted complete exemption from *munera extraordinaria*; that is, all those duties which did not occur regularly and annually. The main item of these extraordinary duties was the so-called super-tax imposed in prosperous years upon the peasants by the legitimate authority; they were made to give "alium corbem frumenti" in addition to the usual land tax. A further exemption was conceded to clerics from all those taxes which were called *tributa mixta*. The chief item of this category was service in the army, since the soldier had to live "de suo patrimonio", but fighting itself constituted, of course, a personal service.

It remains now to be seen which categories of individuals fell under the heading of clerics. It was agreed that third orders could not claim any exemption from taxes. Baldus stated that the Sisters of the third order of St. Francis could not be called "ecclesiasticae personae", and Bartolus maintained the same about the brotherhoods of third orders. On the other hand, the privileged position which was granted to the clerics benefited also their "mancipia", i.e. the household employed by the individual cleric or monastery. In practical terms, the farmers tilling the land, the workmen, and all other personnel shared the privileges enjoyed by the clerics themselves. The members of the household could not, therefore, be forced to pay taxes or to perform personal services. The reason underlying this privileged

position of the household was, perhaps, best expressed by Baldus, who said that they "gaudent privilegio ipsorum dominorum, non principaliter propter se, sed propter favorem dominorum". By leaving the service of the cleric, those members of the household lost their privileged position: "Cessante causa favoris, cessat eorum favor." The position of these individuals in the actual service of the clerics must be clearly kept apart from the position of those—and it is mainly farmers who come into question—who had rented land from an ecclesiastical institution or from a cleric. Those tenants were in no way privileged, and were, therefore, subjected to the orders of the civil power; the tenants had to pay the land tax, regardless of the fact that the owner of the land was privileged.

We have attempted to sketch briefly the fundamental ideas concerning clerical taxation as they were set forth in the voluminous writings of fourteenth-century jurists. A review of these ideas allows of two observations. The one concerns the praiseworthy achievements of the scholars to clarify the position of both Church and State in regard to the latter's demand for clerical taxation. The scholars, by impartially weighing the arguments, proposed a solution of this thorny problem which, from the point of view of the Church, cannot be regarded as contrary to justice and fairness: they made out a moral duty of the Church and clerics to contribute to the growing expenses, which duty, owing to its very nature, was not enforceable. On the other hand—and this brings us to the second observation—the operational basis upon which the investigation was conducted was formed by the easily attractive concept of the public interest, a principle which slips very gently into the modern chimera of public expediency. Yet to lay the blame for this development upon mediaeval scholars would be unjust and wrong; neither did they invent the concept of *publica utilitas*\*—they simply elaborated this idea by way of expounding general principles inherent in Roman law; nor can they be made responsible for the later degeneration which this concept was made to suffer at the hands of an all-powerful State.

W. ULLMANN.

\* How much this concept was used in many other departments of law and politics I have tried to show in my book *The Medieval Idea of Law. A Study in Fourteenth-Century Legal Scholarship*, shortly to be published by Messrs. Methuen and Co. Ltd.

## THE ROYAL QUESTION IN BELGIUM

IN the autumn of 1908 a young schoolboy was dismissed from the Naval Academy at Osborne. The authorities had charged him with the theft of a few shillings. As the father of the small boy was not convinced of his son's guilt he girded his loins and challenged the whole naval bureaucracy to battle. It took Martin Archer-Shee two years to clear his son's reputation. It cost him lots of money, but all his efforts were rewarded when, at the end, truth prevailed. Young Archer-Shee was no thief. He had never been a thief.

The story of this boy does not only exemplify the magnificent courage and unyielding stubbornness with which a father in this particular instance took up the defence of his child; it clearly shows, too, that justice is no idle or meaningless word in the English vocabulary.

The case I intend to relate in these pages is not concerned with the adventures of a small boy, nor is its interest limited to the happiness of one family. It is simply the case of a King on whose fate may depend the existence of a country and the prosperity of millions.

A few months ago King Leopold of the Belgians was put in the pillory. His conduct of the war, his policy prior to the German invasion, his public life and his private actions were subjected to violent criticisms. The expressions used to disparage his honour, the threats uttered to intimidate his supporters, surpassed in violence almost anything flung in passionate hatred at the man who is responsible for the war in Europe. Practically everybody, from collaborators to Communists, was given the opportunity of trampling on his good name. Nor was this skulduggery confined to Belgium. Foreign newspapers put their columns at the disposal of all those who wanted to defame, to belittle or to blame the King.

And yet up to now no conclusive evidence has been given of the King's treason; none of the charges put forward against his person has been proved. On the contrary, everyone who takes the trouble to analyse them will soon admit that they are but a heap of rubbish or a medley of wild rumours. Even the impeachment of 21 July, 1945, displays gaps large enough to allow whole trucks to pass.

It is my firm belief that the part taken in the campaign against King Leopold by foreign press agents resulted from their ignorance of the situation in Belgium rather than from their animosity

towards his personality. They were not aware of the issues at stake or the implications involved.

For, if they had known that in Belgium the very existence of the country depends on the presence of the King, they would never have gone so far as to sponsor the cause of those political factions which nursed the hope of ridding the country of the King until they disappeared in the final disaster of the German Reich.

Let us try therefore to understand what royalty really means to Belgium, and in the second place let us examine whether there is any ground for the charges advanced against King Leopold.

In a certain sense the Belgian King is only a figurehead—or an indiarubber stamp, as G. B. Shaw might say. He is a constitutional King, and as such he has no real effective power except as supreme commander of the Army, and even then his power is limited by many restrictions. He resides officially in his palace at Brussels, travels a good deal of the year, shakes hands with national and other heroes on special occasions, drops a few lines of sympathy to people struck by disaster, and is the godfather of every seventh son in large families.

If these functions alone constituted his whole activity, we had better lighten the burden of the taxpayers and send him to Bermuda with a life pension. The King, however, cannot be dispensed with in Belgium, because he plays the rôle of a catalyst, keeping together elements which but for his presence would never coalesce. This country may look very small on the map, and, from the other side of the Channel, with so many miles between, very easy to run. In fact it is a house naturally divided against itself. More than any other country, she has problems to deal with arising from racial, linguistic and historical disparities that tend to rip her all along her seams. She was founded as a state only a good hundred years ago and she owes her existence mainly to foreign Powers.

It is not easy at all, even to her scholars, to give a clear and definite view of the causes that ultimately led to the separation of the Southern and Northern Netherlands.

However, so much is certain that the united kingdom of the Netherlands was erected at the conference of Vienna in 1815 to prevent any further northward expansion of France, and that from the first moment of its existence France considered this new state as a thorn in her side and a threat to her security. No wonder, therefore, that she lent a hand in fomenting insurrection against the Dutch, and that weeks before the outbreak of the so-called Belgian revolution, in 1830, French officers and soldiers crossed the frontier on their way to Brussels. The Dutch were

driven out of Belgium by a French general and a French Army and the Union ended after fifteen years of seemingly carefree existence.

From that moment on the French felt quite at home in the new country: an overwhelming majority of the officers of the new Belgian Army were French, and so were a good many civil servants. The French language was given a predominant place in education and public affairs and the persecution of whatever was Dutch (Flemish) set in. This denationalizing process was not confined only to an endeavour to wipe out the teutonic element in Belgium. Its scope was much wider and stretched beyond mere cultural matters. It was designed to prevent the rise of the Flemish people on the social ladder, to keep them as non-specialized workers in factories and plants at the lowest possible wages, to deplete their vitality, and to decrease their numbers. What could be the opportunities of a Flemish boy when he was sent to work at the age of nine, had to work fourteen hours a day for almost nothing, and coughed out his lungs in the dirty tenements where his parents lived?

And yet, bit by bit, they rose out of the mire into which years of persecution had sunk them. They learnt to speak French, they founded their own cultural movements and associations, they built schools, they made opportunities where no opportunities were offered them, and acquired slowly a political and social status in the country which a few years earlier might have seemed a utopian enterprise. In 1930 the University of Ghent came into their hands, and most other universities were reorganized on a Flemish basis. With their growing power the memories of the black days they had gone through surged up, and they went in for political equality. Brussels, the capital, had been lost to their cause during the battle, and in many other Flemish cities the last defenders of exclusive French culture had fortified themselves in the strongholds erected for them by a too complaisant state. But the process of battering down these last bulwarks was going on relentlessly until a new German invasion, in 1940, brought all constructive policy on the Flemish side to an end.

In the meantime, the Walloons, the French-speaking population of the south, had seen with growing unrest how Flemings got into key positions, how the decrease of their own birth-rate (the south has more caskets than cradles) would reduce them to playing only the second fiddle in Belgium, how the north was industrializing rapidly and how new coal-pits, with far greater output than their own, had been put into operation. The south was running to its decline in high gear. Against 4,000,000 Flemings they could marshal only 2,200,000 of their own num-

bers. Most of all, Brussels was no longer a place which they could claim as their own.

Brussels, the capital of the country, is not its heart. It has developed a special atmosphere of its own, and a way of living and thinking better suited for international travellers than for the citizens of the country. To Brussels only Brussels is all-important, and Flemings and Walloons join hands in criticizing bitterly the denationalized city. Feeling lost, the Walloons turned to France for redemption. When their national congress met in November 1945 at Liège all, or nearly all, the speakers, among whom were a few Cabinet Ministers, advocated the reunion with France.

Such is the political situation in Belgium: two racial groups struggling to get the upper hand in the country at the expense of the vanquished and a capital unaware of the deepest problems of the country; two groups, drifting apart more and more, and a city of 1,000,000 inhabitants with no interest in what is happening beyond her outskirts.

It is clear that somebody is needed, and urgently needed, to remedy the situation. The man to tackle this job can only be the King. No Walloon or Fleming could ever be impartial enough in the struggle of the contesting groups. No Belgian could be found to include all citizens into the sphere of his solicitude. Somebody above racial strife and whose hands need not be soiled with dirty party politics, somebody who is clear-eyed and sure-handed enough to steer the ship through the storms of fighting parties and to see the point of both sides, is needed in this small and fitful country. This is the rôle of the King.

On both sides of the line running through Belgium from west to east, as well as at Brussels, the King has overwhelming numbers of supporters owing to his unique ability of embodying all tendencies, and since the foundation of Belgium his personality, in the main, was responsible for keeping together and unifying partners who would, without the shadow of a doubt, have been put asunder by ever so many conflicting elements.

A few months ago, however, it looked as if we had reached low-water mark for royalty in Belgium. Some trouble, anyhow, was to be expected, but people never guessed that all their worries would come to a head during this period. This is the second time that a political party has availed itself of the critical situation created by four years of German occupation to secure advantages which no normal state of affairs would ever allow them to obtain. After World War I, King Albert had to cope with immense difficulties from the side of the Socialists before being allowed to ascend his throne. Yet he had stayed with his troops all the time, he had

lived their life and had shared the responsibility of planning the ultimate defeat of the imperial German armies. When he returned to his country, at the head of his victorious armed forces, the Socialists made him promise all and everything to achieve their ends. If this could happen to a victorious father, what would not be the plight of the son who had lost a battle and had been made responsible for the downfall of France?

As I said before, everybody expected new quibbling and bickering at the return of the London Government in Belgium. Probably serious efforts would be made to debar King Leopold from his throne. But that the whole question was going to take the course it did take, could not be foreseen except by those who staged the crisis. In order to understand the situation let us briefly recall what has happened since the spring of 1940.

After the capitulation of the Belgian Army on 28 May, 1940, a hurricane of abuse swept down on King Leopold. His capitulation was called downright treason, and when, instead of asking the English for hospitality, he preferred to stay with his troops, this, too, was interpreted as a sign of weakness and pro-German feelings on his part. The Belgian population, however, was thankful in the extreme for this courageous decision. Piles of flowers were showered every day at the gate of his palace, numberless posters and pictures demonstrated the heartfelt gratitude of the whole nation for the young King, who, as long as the struggle had a chance of success, opposed the invaders with every means at his disposal, and, when all opposition became senseless and cruel stubbornness, did not hesitate to lay down arms to save the lives of many.

To accuse the King of treason because his troops had proved unable to withstand the German onslaught appeared soon enough a slanderous subterfuge of M. Reynault's to find a scapegoat for the impending disaster of the French Army. Moreover, the British Admiral, Lord Keyes, who was present at the tragic surrender of the Belgian Army and had closely studied the whole situation on the spot, stated that if anyone was to blame, it certainly was not the King of the Belgians, a statement which he repeated most emphatically, only a few months ago, in the teeth of a snarling Belgian Government.

King Leopold spent the four years of occupation in Belgium a prisoner, most of the time in his palace at Brussels. When the food situation deteriorated, farmers sent him butter and eggs and wheat, but on the whole nothing much was heard of him except that he constantly refused all offers of collaboration with the Germans. His conduct was approved of by all the Belgians on the home front, and on the London radio, too, reconciling words

were spoken, putting the blame for the rash judgement passed on the King after the defeat of 1940 on M. Reynault and his passionate hatred of Leopold. In point of fact, nobody seemed to blame in 1942: a series of irresistible disasters had crushed an unfortunate country and the sooner everything could be forgotten, the better.

After Stalingrad, things took a different turn. This momentous battle showed, even to the blind, that the game was up for the Germans, and from this moment on the Communist party leaders, who had been faithful collaborationists until 21 June, 1941, made it their heartfelt duty to blaze the way for Communism.

Communism is inconsistent with any form, good or bad, of royal government. The political truce came to an end and the smear campaign against the King regained new strength.

The King, it was rumoured, had married a commoner. How could a King marry a commoner unless he was a traitor? There is, of course, something ridiculous in the fact that this criticism was expressed by Communists. But they were only too glad to use any weapons at their disposal and they were willing to go to any length in their mud-slinging campaign. A Belgian Quisling, they said, had married the King's bride's sister and went every day to dinner at the palace. The King was surrounded by traitors of his own choice and showed everybody his profound satisfaction that Germany was going to win the war. There was no end to his felony. He was no longer fit to govern Belgium, for he had debased and reviled himself in every possible way.

Nor was this all. Even before the outbreak of hostilities the King had been a traitor. In 1939 a stray German aeroplane had landed somewhere in Belgium carrying the plans of the German General Staff. These plans had been forwarded to the King, who, instead of publishing them, had locked them up in his safe and kept mum about the episode. And so on and so forth. Is it necessary to refute these wild charges? I think not, and after all only a few people were disposed to believe in the Communists' unconditional love of truth.

The Allies landed in Normandy and a few days later a proclamation of the King was made public telling the people that he had been forcibly removed to Germany, without even being allowed to kiss his children good-bye. August dragged itself to a close. Early September saw a liberated Belgium frantically cheering and acclaiming the gallant soldiers who had come to her rescue for the second time within twenty-five years. But even amidst the homeric rejoicings, the huge masses of flowers, the loud poppings of fireworks, the hundreds of flags waving in the

streets, people could not forget the absent King. Then Germany collapsed, and every day they expected the return of the royal prisoner. But the King did not come back. Why? Had anything gone wrong? Prime Minister Van Acker made ready to go and make inquiries. After a few days he came back and explained in a hushed and tearful voice that the King was ill and unable to travel. The King would stay just a few more days in Germany and come back when his heart attack had been cured. But the King did not return. Soon it was reported that Van Acker had tried to browbeat the King into abdication. Asked if there was any truth in the rumour, Minister Van Acker answered bluntly that he considered monarchy a necessity for Belgium, but the present King a nuisance. He then drew a picture of King Leopold which no German cartoonist had ever dreamt of. The King was a stubborn man, not knowing which way to go, hopelessly childish, moody and unable to control his nerves in any emergency. He had better go, and the King himself and everybody else besides would feel all the better for it. On being informed of this mean and unprecedented procedure, the King appealed to his people, expressing his will to come back to Belgium and to stay on the throne as long as the Belgian people wanted him to stay there. No Cabinet, not even Parliament, that had outlived itself for more than three years, had the power of making him resign if an abdication was not desired by the Belgian people. So the King determined to get back to Belgium. As soon as this decision was known, Mr. Van Acker published a statement that from his side nothing would be done to keep order in the country or to enforce the law if the King dared to come back. There was no fear of any disturbance whatever in the country when that statement was made, nor was there any unrest among the people. On the contrary, everybody made ready to receive the King in a royal way and give him a hearty welcome. Mr. Van Acker's proclamation was a threat of revolution. The Catholic Ministers left the Cabinet and went into opposition. A new alliance between Communists, Liberals and Socialists was effected and members of all three parties gave vent to their hatred of the King. A new Government had succeeded the Government that had come back from London. Though most of the Belgians were glad at the end of the war to have representatives at the conference table of the United Nations, Mr. Pierlot and his team were never popular. How could they be? They made their entrance in Brussels saying that they were just a handful of loyal Belgians among a nation of traitors. They had not been able to follow the evolution of Belgian political thought throughout the war and felt strangers in their own country after four years of absence. Besides, the

food situation was bad, fuel only to be had at enormous prices on the black market, and butter scarcer even than under the German occupation. They were not equal to the task that lay ahead. A new Cabinet was formed under Mr. Van Acker.

Mr. Van Acker could look back on a prosperous career. Born at Bruges, from poor parents, he had managed to educate himself. In turn he became a docker, a bricklayer, a Socialist propagandist, an art connoisseur and a poet. He lived happily and contentedly at his home in Bruges. The times when he tried to stir revolutionary feelings in the hearts of the Flemish people with his euphuistic poetry were long since forgotten. He had made his peace with Belgium and fortune and lived the quiet days of the Belgian bourgeois, priding himself on his pictures and his ribbons. During World War II he was tied up in some way with a resistance movement and had sensed the coming liberation with its political possibilities. He plunged again into active party politics and found himself one day within a few strokes of the supreme goal. He became Prime Minister, and promised coal, butter and bread and all the joys of paradise into the bargain.

Such is the man chosen by the dark forces, driving at the expulsion of King Leopold from his throne, to execute the dreadful job. Together with a few other anointed politicians belonging to different parties, but drawing their inspiration from the selfsame source, he pledged himself to slay the dragon and rid the country of the presence of the King. He had to be very careful at first. He could not afford to arouse the suspicion of the people, for he realized full well that no popular movement would ever back him or his schemes. That is why he pretended to be sick at heart when he set out on his dreadful and ignoble task. He had to summon up all the courage which remained to him after having spent so much of it against the German invaders. He had continually to bear in mind, in order to keep himself going, that the only aim he had in view was the common weal of the whole nation. No other motive, however lofty, could ever urge him to loose his dogs on a man whom he alleged to like so much that he would gladly extol him to the skies, but whose presence in the country could not be tolerated any longer for reasons too distressing to be made public.

Outside Belgium, people must have gathered the impression that, except for the Catholics, the hearts of a large majority were beating in unison with Mr. Van Acker's pulse. Let us dispel that delusion. It is so easy to influence a few foreign journalists who ignore the language of the common man, and have to depend mainly on the information distilled to them by a cautious Ministry

of Propaganda. Viewing the situation as a whole, one must keep in mind, too, that in Belgium not even Parliament, at this moment, is entitled to call itself an adequate expression of the people's will. Its members do not, for the moment at least, represent the people by whom they were chosen back in 1939. Nor can the political parties themselves boast a complete cohesion in their own ranks.

The Liberals, for instance, were divided over the issue, so were the Socialist representatives of Antwerp and so were the Catholics, and as to the Communists, no one really believes that the number of anti-royalist followers which they hope for in their wishful expectations is borne out by facts. But there is more. Belgian Parliament has been for a long time one of the best in Europe. It could look back on a splendid tradition of comradeship and goodwill. It was, generally speaking, free from meanness, jealousy and intrigue. Its members were statesmen of the grand style, leading public opinion according to their conscience and the interests of the nation, rather than politicians led by the swaying fads of mob favour. Of course every one of them must have been convinced that his party was the best, but they never lost sight of the general interests of the country. But, as so many human institutions, Belgian Parliament, too, underwent the corrosive influence of corruption during the late 'thirties. At the outbreak of war in 1940 a certain number of its members belonged to what I must call a gang of cunning bandwagon hoppers, who discredited the parliamentary system in the eyes of a great many Belgians and are responsible on this account for the fact that German new order was able to distil its poison into the minds of sincere Belgians. They were the men in top hats and striped trousers, with polished manners and refined speech, with heavy gold watch-chains slung across immaculate waist-coats, who stamped the conviction on the world that bribe-taking and embezzlement were as common in Belgium as fleas on a stray mongrel. When the war broke out they drifted as helpless waifs on the roads of France, beaten by the storms of the invasion and stranded on the quicksands of Limoges, where they cheered M. Reynault when he put the blame for the lost battle on the King of the Belgians. When at last Germany seemed to be firmly established in the saddle, they apologized to the King for their notorious blunder, came back to Belgium, and lived quietly throughout the four years of occupation, undisturbed and unmolested, while the people groaned and suffered under the German jackboot, that bore down on them with the full weight of Nazi ruthlessness.

No wonder that Mr. Van Acker found very obliging tools

among their numbers to carry out his subversive schemes. Accounts would certainly be settled when the war was over, and they knew full well that the peal of the ringing bells welcoming the King to his capital would sound in their ears as the tolling of a knell. So why not forestall the forthcoming doom by refusing the King all access to his land and his throne?

The King, being far away from his country and having no other means of knowing the mind of his people (a plebiscite or a referendum or even a Gallup poll being unconstitutional), invited representative people from all social ranks to his residence and held a series of conferences in order to gauge, with strict impartiality, the wishes of the people. The outcome of these talks saw him more determined than ever to recover his throne. As soon as this decision was known, Mr. Van Acker and his hirelings staged a *coup d'état* and he and his friends decided to join efforts in one big attack on the King and the throne.

20 July was really the heyday of a wizard. All members of Parliament were present, the atmosphere was tense with dramatic anticipation, and when the Prime Minister took the floor everyone knew that the King's fate was sealed. His big, roaring voice grew husky and doleful when he read the accusations against the King. In part he resumed the old charges of the Communists. The King had married a commoner, the King had paid Hitler a visit at Berchtesgaden and the King was responsible for his own abduction to Germany. No revealing detail, no evidence or proof of these charges, was given, but floods of cheap rhetoric were released to wash away all suspicion concerning Van Acker's good faith. There is nothing in the world like a persuasive speech to fuddle and befog the critical mind of an audience. Mr. Van Acker sat down victorious. At least, so he thought. But the tide favouring the King did not subside even after his magnificent piece of oratory. Objections poured down on his head thick as hail. No proof had been given of his assertions, no evidence could probably be given. The one thing Van Acker had done was to kick up a dust in order to add to the vagueness of his arguments. Were there any arguments against the King? the whole population wondered. To approve of the meanest schemes undermining the King's authority and to state in the same breath that you are doing everything possible to save the King is just humbug. The very magnitude of the accusation brought to bear against the King and the vagueness of the proofs had a smirching effect on Van Acker's good name, and all the clouds of ink emitted by the professional cuttlefish in his pay could not divert the people's attention. People felt fleeced and grew suspicious. They grew even more suspicious when Van Acker was caught with his pants

down. In one of his speeches he had asserted that the King had never invited him to take cognizance of the royal documents. The King maintained the contrary. The persons present at the interview Mr. Van Acker had with King Leopold at St. Wolfgang were officially asked about it and all of them testified to the King's truthfulness. Thus Mr. Van Acker was forced to show his one remaining trump.

When Sumner Welles was sent to Europe in the spring of 1940 to make one last desperate effort to save the peace, he was received by Hitler at his Chancellery on the Wilhelmstrasse. Ribbentrop and an interpreter, named Schmidt, were the only two German officials present at the interview. Sumner Welles goes on to describe, in his book *The Time for Decision*, p. 125, how Hitler spoke with clarity and precision and how he was able to follow every word in German, "although," he says, "Dr. Schmidt interpreted and at times inaccurately".

This same ubiquitous Dr. Schmidt was present at the interview King Leopold had with the Fuehrer on 19 November, 1940. They drank tea together and, as usual, Hitler did most of the talking. Why did King Leopold go to Hitler? Unless we think that the bare fact of calling on Hitler constitutes a major crime, the motive behind the visit should be considered of the greatest importance. Sumner Welles went to Germany to save the peace and we all approve of his mission. And many were the interviews Mr. Molotov had with Hitler and his Foreign Minister, yet nobody looks askance at him for that reason. Several days after the interview with King Leopold, Dr. Schmidt made a report on the visit. This report has no official character, nor did the King know about it. It was intended solely for private use. In substance, Dr. Schmidt writes that the King came to Berchtesgaden to safeguard Belgian independence, to secure the release of Belgian prisoners and plead for the relief of the food situation in his country, but in return for his demands the King did not make any concessions, notes Dr. Schmidt. The wording of some passages, however, could be interpreted as unfavourable to England. But the impression of the document, on the whole, is certainly to the advantage of the King's essential honesty and bears uncompromising testimony to his solicitude for the unity of his country. Now the question arises as to who should be made responsible for the objectional passage on England's policy. Mr. Van Acker answers: the King, and only the King. Those who are in the slightest way familiar with Hitler's speeches know that he never uttered a word at the end without incriminating England. When the King was shown the document, he immediately answered in a public letter to the Government that these words had been

spoken by Hitler, and he appealed to his own documents, the documents Mr. Van Acker had refused to read.

At the next session of Parliament, question-time saw a Prime Minister groping for words, humiliated and hopelessly fumbling, until his Minister for Foreign Affairs Spaak came to his rescue, and Mr. Van Acker must have felt extremely glad to see the whole thing adjourned. This particular debate was never reopened.

It is not certain at all that Mr. Van Acker is mainly responsible for the King's plight. There is a man in his Cabinet who avoids coming into the open as much as possible, but who, whenever there is a gap in Mr. Van Acker's statements, is ready to fill it with all his authority. That man is Paul-Henri Spaak. Members of Parliament listening to Mr. Van Acker's speeches have more than once gathered the impression that the trap to catch the King has been set by Mr. Spaak, for, whenever Mr. Van Acker is unable to throw a light on his supposedly own views, his meaning is interpreted in the orthodox way by Paul-Henri Spaak.

Now I consider it bad tactics in order to defend a cause to throw mud at the opposing side. But facts are facts and I must discharge my conscience by relating the whole truth.

Mr. Spaak is about fifty. Though plump in appearance he is as slippery as an eel. He knows all the tricks of rhetoric and his words taken at their face value are always convincing. He knows the foibles of his opponents and he admits his own shortcomings. He has been Belgian Foreign Minister for almost ten years and he conducts his affairs with the broad laugh of the man who enjoys his food. A Socialist in his political convictions, he never had in mind to close the door on any further evolution of his political creed. There was even a time, it is reported, when he fully relished a brand of Socialism conceived in a national sense. But those are bygone days, and the friend with whom he planned to study the general lines of that kind of Socialism at Nuremberg was sentenced for collaboration, by a Belgian court, in 1945. After the capitulation of the Belgian Army, Mr. Spaak went to France and installed his ponderous suitcases in a fine mansion and from that vantage-point awaited the coming events.

Europe's fate after the fall of France seemed decided, and the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, having distributed Belgian Army flags to his friends, was heard to say, they tell us, that for a thousand years at least Europe would be German. If Belgium were to exist any longer, it would be in the German orbit. However, as far as he could see at the time, the Germans would never apply in his country the same social engineering system which had yielded such magnificent fruits in the Baltic States. Their gentleman-like behaviour when they first entered Belgium seemed

to imply that the horrors of 1914 belonged definitely to the past. After all, where men live united in some sort of society, some sort of government is necessary, and people with experience in these matters can prove to be very useful.

Thus Mr. Spaak, seemingly convinced of the invincibility of the German Army, and not altogether impervious to the idea of playing his part in the reconstruction of Europe, tried to contact the German authorities at Wiesbaden. The capitulation of May would become a peace treaty, dragging with it political consequences and deciding on the future fate of Belgium. The Germans, however, refused Mr. Spaak's good services. Nothing was left to him but to go to England, where, as everyone knows, he became our national hero. His indomitable spirit, his dauntless speeches, his unshaken confidence in the future of Belgium, and the certainty with which he predicted, time and again, the final doom of Germany made him rise to the height of the prophets of old. While Mr. Van Acker has assumed the official rôle of president of the tribunal impeaching the King of felony, Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak seems to take enormous delight in his functions of prosecutor-general. Sometimes he complains in a wailing voice of the treatment he receives at the hands of the major part of the Belgian people. But for him, according to his assertions, Belgium would never have been one of the victorious United Nations, and his weaknesses at the time of the collapse of France must be forgiven him, considering all the good services he rendered Belgium afterwards. Later on Mr. Spaak tried to mitigate some harsh expressions he had used concerning the King. The cocksureness and the conceit he affected in the first hours of the battle gradually disappeared and gave way to speeches the tenor of which might imply the belated conversion of one who has sinned much but knows that somewhere there must be forgiveness for every repentant sinner. At one time he gave the King the door, but he is trying hard at the moment to leave this door on the latch.

The average Belgian realizes that the very presence of the King in the country spared him the oppression which neighbouring lands, such as Holland, had to undergo at the hands of Seiss Inquart and his henchmen, and that this presence, too, kept the local Lavals and Quislings at bay. He knows that the King never played the game of the invaders, for, if he did, why did not the Germans make propaganda with it? Could there possibly have been a better asset to strengthen their wavering policy than a royal name sponsoring their cause? Most certainly the King went to Berchtesgaden, he drank tea with Hitler, but so did the average Belgian. Not that he ever drank tea with Hitler personally, but

more than once he went to the local Kommandantur, and not always with the intention of offering his good services to the representatives of the master race. Is it not preposterous, he asks himself, that the fate of the King should depend on the favourable or unfavourable hair-splitting of an obscure phrase written by a German anxious to establish his own alibi?

Let the King come back, let us resume work and restore among us good faith and mutual understanding and, above all, let us keep good watch lest Belgium's provisional government should become a permanent tyranny.

H. HANSEN.

---

---

## TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA

"Your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity, your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness."

Isaiah 59, 2

IF British public opinion were to form its judgement from the Press, it might very well gain the impression that, in the main, the Yugoslav problem has been settled to the general satisfaction of the parties concerned. Articles, letters, reports and news about the régime in power that have appeared in the Press give a wholly distorted picture of Tito's Yugoslavia. Some have asserted that Joseph Broz-Tito is the most liberal-minded man in the Balkans, and that all Yugoslav Governments hitherto have been no more than reactionary cliques. Others have adopted the view that General Drazha Mihailovich and the Yugoslav regular army under his command are the only bodies which fought against the occupying troops, whereas "Marshal" Tito, with his Partisan forces, were fighting merely to bring about a social revolution and to seize power.

All this, in our opinion, is of secondary importance for the time being. Historians will pass objective judgement on the events which have taken place in Yugoslavia during the past four years. Those who have a real knowledge of Yugoslav affairs know that today, not only for all Yugoslavs (be they Serbs, Croats or Slovenes; Orthodox, Catholics or Moslem; Left Wing,

Liberal or Right Wing) but for all the United Nations, only two questions matter:

(1) Is the régime now in force in Yugoslavia democratic or not?

(2) Were the decisions made at the Yalta Conference carried out under the present régime or not?

Never has there been so much discussion of Democracy and Freedom as during this war, and the question now is whether the necessary elements of Democracy, without which no Liberty whatever can be conceived, exist in the present Yugoslavia of the Communist Broz-Tito.

Fundamental civic rights embrace the two ideas of Freedom and Equality. Liberty is the right of every man to live without external coercion, to enjoy political rights, to express his thoughts in speech, in literature or in the Press, to believe in whatever faith he chooses, to enjoy the right to freedom of action. Freedom is, in effect, placing the police under control of the laws.

But Yugoslavia today is a police State, i.e. a State in which the police knows no law. Just as, in Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany, no one who valued his freedom dared to express an opinion contrary to the dogmas of Fascism or Nazism, so today, in Tito's Yugoslavia, no one dare show disagreement with the Communist ideology. Those who do not agree with these views are arrested, deported or shot. All participation in public life—political, social or economic—is conditional on acceptance of the ideology of the present masters of Yugoslavia. Whoever does not grasp or believe this basic characteristic of the present régime in Yugoslavia will be merely bewildered by any news from those parts of the world.

When authority in the country was handed over to Tito the representatives of the régime declared that they stood for the principle of religious tolerance. How that works in practice is testified by the numerous reports received from Yugoslavia; by Mgr. Stepinatz, the Archbishop of Zagreb, who sent a joint Pastoral Letter to all Catholic Croats at the close of the Conference of Croatian Bishops; by a resolution passed at a Grand Assembly of the Serbian Orthodox Clergy; by different statements published in the Press of this country; by Dr. Machek, leader of the Croatian Peasant Party; by the declarations made by His Holiness the Serbian Patriarch Gabriel during his recent visit to London; by Lord Bishop Irenaeus of Dalmatia and Lord Bishop Nicholas of Zhicha; even by Mr. Randolph Churchill,

who was one of the first to support Tito in this country. From all those documents which we have read it is made clear that the régime is carrying out pure Communism which is directed against the Church.

Freedom of the Press is also unknown in Tito's Yugoslavia. About 195 newspapers are being published, but they are all organs of the Communist Party or of the régime, which is practically the same. Since the liberation of Belgrade, in October 1944, not a single article has appeared in Tito's Press which is not in conformity with the policy of his régime. Only two Opposition weekly papers were to be allowed: *Democracy* in Belgrade, and *People's Voice* in Zagreb. Shortly before the "elections" the authorities banned the first, of which seven issues in all had been published. Similarly banned was the second, immediately after its first issue.

Article 1 of the Press Law guarantees "Press freedom", but eighteen other articles proceed to restrict it. Article 6 excludes anyone ever connected with "Fascist or pro-Fascist" publications. The loose application of these adjectives in the Communist States is notorious. Article 2 authorizes suspension for "spreading false and alarming rumours, endangering the State", an obviously potent threat. It is also worth noting that the Government controls the distribution of paper and all printing machinery. When freedom of the Press is understood in such a way by Tito, no wonder that eight issues only of Opposition Press organs were allowed to appear during eighteen months of his *Democracy*.

Political parties have no possibility of existence whatsoever, and only meetings of the adherents of those so-called parties which have previously and fully adopted the ideas of the governing Communist Party can take place; to meet "freely" one must have, previously, unconditionally applied to be accepted into the "National Front". This is actually the Communist Party under another name.

However, the unified Yugoslav "National Front" has been joined hitherto only by a certain number of political "parties" whose existence was not even heard of before. None of the leading political parties have joined the totalitarian régime. If any of their members are now to be found in Tito's Government they are there as individuals who have either publicly or surreptitiously accepted the ideas of the newly formed "National Front", not in the capacity of representatives of their political parties, which take no responsibility for what they do.

But Tito himself does not conceal this one-party régime, for, speaking publicly, on 28 January, 1945, he said that ". . . We

must not take into the Government elements which will discuss, wrangle, tender resignations and create crises. We have no use for such Ministers. We need Ministers who will work day and night. . . ." So it is clear that the régime does not even allow its Ministers freedom of discussion.

Conditions in Yugoslavia do not ensure equality among citizens, for in practice all citizens are divided into three categories: the Communists; those who are not Communists but have joined Tito's "National Front"; and all others, who are regarded by the authorities as "Fascists", "reactionaries", "collaborators", or, in four words, "enemies of the people".

The Communists, who at the 1920 elections, which were held absolutely freely—and this is not denied even by Communists themselves—gained only 198,736 votes out of a total poll of 1,607,201, enjoy all possible rights and privileges; the second class is tolerated, for the Communists feel a great lack of men capable of carrying on the State administration; the third class is persecuted in every possible way.

Inequality among the citizens is shown first of all by the right of suffrage. In principle, for instance, all Yugoslavs, after their "liberation", are entitled to vote when they reach the age of eighteen, which is that of political maturity, as everyone knows. Tito's armed forces reached that happy state at any age, as is expressly put down by the new Electoral Law. This inequality among the citizens of Yugoslavia does not apply solely to political rights and the amount of security which they ensure; it occurs in the petty affairs of daily life, and there is also economic inequality founded on political affiliation. Those—another instance of free life in Yugoslavia—who refuse or cannot attend the daily conferences of Tito's various political committees are deprived of their fuel ration.

The social provisions which are in force in present Yugoslavia also bear the characteristics of the strictest dictatorship of an insignificant minority over the majority. The industrial class form 9.9 per cent of the total population, and only one section favours the Communist régime. This section is "assisted" by a small group of "educated" Communists. This minority rules dictatorially over 78.9 per cent of peasants, 11.2 per cent of other professions, and the other section of the workers who are not Communists.

But the present totalitarian régime rules not only by the use of terrorist methods over adults. It is drawing children into politics. Education of the children is also, of course, State controlled. In point of fact the State takes the form of fanatical youths or terrified, half-starved professional teachers who expound

to bewildered peasant children the latest slogans about Glory and Plenty. All private schools have been closed, and all but one seminary. Religious teaching is in fact non-existent. Tito has formed his own "Tito-Jugend", busily engaged in his adoration. They are called "Pioneers", and are organized on the Communist "cell" principle, with the purpose of undermining the influence of parents and priests.

One of the aims of the present régime is the destruction of the family as the basis of society. With this purpose in view a whole series of regulations have been passed. Family obligations are put aside. Emphasis is put solely on the duty to the ruling party and devotion to Tito. As in Germany in the heyday of Hitlerism, the children are taught to spy upon their parents and report their political views. We have the names of children who have been evicted from school for refusing to do so.

The confiscation of 2000 industrial and commercial concerns has been announced. But what is more alarming, 30,000 home-steads belonging to Serbian peasants were confiscated on account of the owners' alleged "collaboration". The entire foreign trade has passed into the State hands. A series of legal measures were enforced concerning the taking over of trade by the State.

Of equal, if not greater, significance is the concealed, indirect nationalization of economic enterprises which have for the most part been put under inexperienced management. Any excuse is good enough for expropriation, and the present rulers of Yugoslavia are not particular as to their means. The nationalization of industry and trade is carried out by accusing the merchants and manufacturers—and there are not very many in an agrarian country—of "collaboration" and sentencing them to death or long terms of penal servitude; or else accusing them of what, in the eyes of the present rulers, is an even worse crime, collaboration with General Mihailovich, which almost invariably carries the death penalty, while their property is confiscated. We do not assert that it is impossible for some manufacturers or merchants to have collaborated with the enemy. But the accusation of collaboration is being used so broadly by Tito's supporters that anyone in Yugoslavia today could be accused of "collaboration"; the very fact of "going to law" can be regarded as result of "collaboration". The aim of the "judges" is not collaboration but confiscation of property.

The country which gave 23 per cent of its total population to the Allied cause in the First World War and sacrificed 10 per cent of its best men and women for the cause of Freedom in the Second World War is, according to J. Broz-Tito, the country with the greatest number of "traitors"!

In a real Democracy a civil servant may preach any political theory and belong to whatever political party he likes. Today the Yugoslav civil servants must swear to observe the ideology of one political party whose publicly admitted aim is the realization of a totalitarian régime. What happened to the civil servants after the "liberation"? We shall let M. Voya Lekovich, the Minister of Trade and Supply for Serbia, give the answer to this question. He said, on 13 June, 1945, that "... the old apparatus of the former Yugoslavia is completely broken, and we have broken it intentionally because it was an essential duty which we could not neglect. . . ."

A new "National Militia" has taken the place of the professional police; besides this "National Militia" there exists the ill-reputed O.Z.N.A., or "Committee for the Protection of the People". This secret political police is worse than the Gestapo, and is Tito's most terrible arm against the half-starved, simple population.

In democratic countries the judicial power is exercised by professional judges on the basis of the laws. In Yugoslavia, however, all Courts and laws have been abolished. By a decree of 3 January, 1945, the entire legal and judicial structure of the country was destroyed. Legal procedure takes place today in the so-called "People's Courts", in which often there is not one legally trained person, while the "judges" make their decisions—even on capital charges—on the basis of their "conscience", and some subsequently passed very sketchy legal regulations; that is to say, they act at their discretion.

What legal standard the dictatorial régime applies in order to retain its power can be seen from one instance, i.e. from the text for the establishment of "Special Courts" to deal with crimes and offences "against people's honour". It is stated therein that even if their action may not be classed as "treason", or as "assisting the enemy in committing war crimes", the citizens of "democratic" Tito's Yugoslavia may be sentenced to ten years' penal servitude and the loss of their entire property for an act which is not definitely foreseen, and is arbitrarily ascertained by a Court consisting of twenty-seven members of whom only three have any legal training.

This should be enough to prove that Yugoslavia is a dictatorship, not a Democracy. This was admitted by Tito, who, at a public meeting at Belgrade, on 28 January, 1945, said: "... Are you afraid that we shall not have Democracy? [Unanimous reply: 'We are not!'] We are told: We must have Democracy; one party means dictatorship . . . give freedom to all parties! And if the people does not want certain small parties, but one

National Movement? [Acclamation and cries of: 'Only one Movement! We want Tito!'.]

We suggest Dr. Machek's definition of the present condition in Yugoslavia. In an interview given to the correspondent of the *New York Times*, on 22 July, 1945, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party, who had succeeded in getting to Paris, said that "the so-called liberation of Yugoslavia has resulted merely in the change of a totalitarian Nazi régime for a totalitarian Communist régime".

The second question of importance to our Allies, the Yugoslavs, is whether, under the present régime, the principles agreed upon at Yalta are being applied.

In order that the political significance of the Yalta decisions may be understood it is necessary that their text be studied and interpreted in the light of the previously concluded agreements between the Prime Minister of the Royal Yugoslav Government, Dr. Ivan Shubashich, and the President of the National Committee, Joseph Broz-Tito. The chief points of this agreement were: respect for the people's will with regard to the internal organization of the State and the form of Government; application of the basic and general principles of a Constitutional Government; assurance of freedom of person; freedom from fear; freedom of worship; liberty of conscience; freedom of speech; liberty of the Press; freedom of assembly and association; and the appointment of a Regency Council until the settlement of the question of the King and Monarchy. This is the agreement to which Mr. Churchill, Generalissimo Stalin and the late President Roosevelt refer in point seven of the Crimea decisions dealing with Yugoslavia. Their chief provisions were:

- (1) Immediately to put into effect the agreement between Dr. Shubashich and Joseph Broz-Tito.
- (2) Formation of a new Government on the basis of that agreement.
- (3) Broadening of the Anti-Fascist Council so that it should extend to include members of the last Yugoslav Parliament who had not compromised themselves by collaboration with the enemy.
- (4) Calling of a Constituent Assembly which should settle the problems of the King, the Monarchy and the form of Government, and which subsequently should approve all the laws passed by the Anti-Fascist Council.

When the decisions reached at Yalta were made public it seemed to many that all the difficulties as to the method of solving the Yugoslav problem were removed. There was a certain relief. An observer looking at the question impartially might have been tempted to think that the decisions made at Yalta were fairly good. To the informed Yugoslavs the solution did not seem promising. They considered the solution rather sceptically, since they could best assess Tito's sense of Liberty and his followers' idea of Democracy. They agreed that the decisions had been taken by men of good will, but that their application in Yugoslavia would be in the hands of a little group of the Communist Party, which was completely uncompromising in its totalitarianism.

**SHUBASHICH-TITO AGREEMENT.**—Without waiting for the calling of a Constituent Assembly, the Anti-Fascist Council laid down that "King Peter is forbidden to return to the country", and passed a series of resolutions which could only have been passed by an elected Constituent Assembly. The title of the State, the flag, the coat of arms and the national anthem have been changed; new postage stamps were issued bearing the head of Tito. These were to be the outward signs of an accomplished change. Tito has deprived the King of his title of Head of the State, having virtually assumed it himself. The laws were no longer enacted by the joint action of Parliament and King, but by the Anti-Fascist Council alone. Tito became the Supreme Commander of the armed forces. He made appointments and promotions. Even decorations were awarded by Tito or the Anti-Fascist Council. Representatives abroad were no longer accredited by the King.

In this way a state of affairs was created in which the Kingdom of Yugoslavia no longer existed, in spite of the fact that, in the agreement and the resolution of Yalta, it was laid down that the form of Government was to be decided by means of legal free elections.

We have shown in the first part of this study how the Government of Tito applied the principles of Democracy. There is, therefore, no need to refer to that again.

This agreement provided that, until the settlement of the question of the King and Monarchy, the Royal prerogatives were to be transferred to a Regency, and the choice of the Regents was to be the King's. But on the pressure from Yalta, King Peter was obliged to choose his three Regents from a list of five put forward by Tito, all names suggested by the King having been previously refused as being unacceptable by the "Marshal".

King Peter transferred his Royal prerogatives to the Regency

Council. But even such a Council, made up of Tito's candidates, could not enjoy the full right of these prerogatives, for the largest number of them was usurped by Tito and the Anti-Fascist Council, and only a small proportion was left to the Regency, and those to a limited degree.

The first Yalta decision about Yugoslavia was not put into force. Tito has not respected the clauses of the agreement, and in applying them he has taken no account of democratic principles but only of his "Titolitarian régime".

**NEW GOVERNMENT.**—The Yalta decisions provided for the establishment of a new united Government. Dr. Shubashich handed to the Regency the resignation of the Royal Government, and Tito called on the Anti-Fascist Council to tender the resignation of the National Committee. Dr. Shubashich and the Anti-Fascist Council then advised the Regents that the "Marshal" should be entrusted with the duty of forming the new Government. All was "carried out" in the manner adopted in the most "liberal" and "democratic" countries.

The same day Tito formed his Government, which consisted of 28 persons: 25 Ministers dividing 29 Portfolios and 3 Ministers without Portfolio. Of the total, only two Ministers were not of the same political opinion as Tito, being members one of the Democratic Party and the other of the Croatian Peasant Party. All Portfolios were in the hands of Tito's nominees. The only two men who were not Tito's men were M. Grol, a Democrat, and Dr. Shutey, a Croatian Peasant; these two held respectively a Deputy Premiership and a seat without Portfolio.

M. Gylasz, Minister for Montenegro, stated on 13 March, 1945, that ". . . it would be a fundamental error to think that the formation of a new Government and the Government's declaration signify a deviation from the present lines in order to moderate its sharpness. . . ."

Tito himself also said at Zagreb, on 22 March, 1945, to those "who still thought that what has come can change, to those who still hope that it will alter, I answer: Brothers and sisters, here nothing can be changed".

It could not be more clearly stated that the formation of the new Government has brought with it nothing new. The second Yalta decision has not been honoured, the application of its provisions has not been put into effect. The Government was formed, it was neither democratic nor representative, just the expression of a single party which had the field clear for the spreading of Red Fascism.

**BROADENING OF THE ANTI-FASCIST COUNCIL.**—It was decided at Yalta that, immediately after the formation of the new Govern-

ment, the Anti-Fascist Council should be widened by the acceptance of all those members of the old Yugoslav Parliament who had not compromised themselves by collaboration with the enemy. This, however, has not been done. As soon as the decision was published, the ruling party in Belgrade reacted by starting to prove that it was impracticable.

At a meeting in Machva (Serbia), M. Zechevich, Home Secretary, said: "... We willingly accept the deputies resulting from these elections (for the old Yugoslav Parliament) if there are still some of them who are honest. . . ."

"... It is difficult to find among them (members of the old Yugoslav Parliament) men who are fit to enter the new Parliament. Only a few can be taken into consideration," declared M. Piyade, Deputy President of the Anti-Fascist Council, on 22 May, 1945.

In a statement to representatives of the foreign Press, M. Kardelye, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for the Constituent Assembly, referred to the broadening of the Anti-Fascist Council, and said, on 29 July, 1945, that this was "perfectly acceptable", but did not go far enough, inasmuch as "a detailed study" had revealed that very few deputies "conform with the spirit of the Crimea Conference proposal".

Further quotations are superfluous. It is clear that most members of the last Yugoslav Parliament had to be proclaimed collaborators, fugitives, irregularly elected, elected with too few votes, missing or dead. Ruling personalities in the Communist Party have so decided. In fact, out of 368 members of the last Yugoslav Parliament, 36 only were admitted in the Anti-Fascist Council.

Therefore, the third provision concerning Yugoslav affairs was not applied as had been agreed, but as it suited Tito and the Communist Party; a travesty of Parliament was quickly achieved; the Anti-Fascist Council ruled as before under another name.

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY.—The dissatisfaction and the despair of the people was growing apace. Tito's tyranny has not succeeded in enslaving the soul of the people. Impartial foreign observers are unanimous in pointing out that the Tito administration finds its sole support in a limited number of rabid guerrillas. On 8 August, 1945, King Peter declared that "the Regents have not been allowed to perform my constitutional duties, and they have ignored their oaths and obligations to me". He decided to "withdraw the authority" which he gave to them. M. Grol resigned on 27 August, 1945, to be followed by Dr. Shubashich, one of the signatories of the Shubashich-Tito Agreement, and by Dr. Shutey. Tito's Government was thus deprived of the last

vestige of its legal foundation. Henceforth the Government was composed solely of Communists and adherents to the "National Front" who were completely subservient to them. All political parties decided to abstain from the elections for the Constituent Assembly, as they were faced by an Electoral Law which rendered the very appearance of candidates on the Opposition list a danger to the candidate's life.

The elections were carried out. Not a single Opposition paper could be published. In the same way not a single public meeting which might criticize the régime could be held. The lists of the voters were compiled by the local committees nominated by the Communists. Whilst children of 12 or 13 years of age had their names entered in the electoral lists, those who were struck off the lists included not only hundreds of thousands of the known opponents of the régime, but also those of the former members of Tito's own Provisional Parliament who had the temerity to vote against the Government proposals. The army and the disproportionately large police force were used not only to terrorize people into recording their votes, but also to transfer those whom they had already terrorized into casting their votes to a number of other polling stations to vote again and again. At numerous places ballot boxes were burned. As a general rule more votes were cast than the total number of the electors of the respective districts, so that electoral committees had to manufacture new records in order to prevent the total number of votes cast from reaching 110 or 120 per cent instead of the modest 95 or 100 per cent of the total electorate as being pro-Tito.

Nevertheless the so-called "National Front" masqueraded as a coalition of "seven parties", the modest Communists contenting themselves with the eighth seat. Unfortunately the "results" speak for themselves: 489 Communists and only 40 representatives of all other "seven parties" were "elected".

Absolutely free elections were held in Yugoslavia in 1920, 1923, 1925 and 1927. The average number of seats obtained by the seven leading parties were 305 out of 343. In 1931 and 1938 the elections were influenced by the Government, yet in the latter case the Opposition block formed by the seven leading parties obtained, despite the difficulties imposed by the Government, 1,336,823 votes, while the Government got 1,636,519 votes. One may well, therefore, ask oneself how Tito could produce 8,383,455 electors, and more especially is one surprised that 90·4 per cent voted for the Communists.

Needless to say, all the decisions of Tito's Constituent Assembly are regularly accepted "unanimously". Acting through the Constituent Assembly thus "elected", and anxious to force the

issue, the Communist Party hastened to abrogate Monarchy and to proclaim Yugoslavia a Republic by "acclamation", leaving the question of the Constitution and constitutional institutions to be decided upon only recently, also by "acclamation". That is the way in which the fourth and last Yalta decision was put into effect. We can, indeed, congratulate the eleven British Parliamentary observers on their penetrating vision of Freedom in Yugoslavia, as they profess to have seen it under Tito's truly democratic sway.

In a report recently received from Yugoslavia it is said, among other things: "... In spite of everything ... people still believe ... people are still hoping and losing their lives. ... They hope, every day, to hear the voice of justice, that they will be delivered from the hands of Partisans who see an 'enemy' and 'Fascist' in every child wishing freely to breathe. ... People say: Give us at least the same régime that the Allies are establishing in occupied Germany. ... It is to these expectations that the Allied Yugoslavia has been reduced."

The régime established today in Yugoslavia has been placed in power by the military might and moral and political support of the Allies. This régime became a challenge to the Allied cause. "Marshal" Tito had not carried out a single obligation which he had undertaken. Under the circumstances he has freed from their obligations the Allies who believed Tito, and attempted to co-operate with him.

Mistakes have been made in all great causes, and are still being made, but it seems to us that it is not yet too late to remedy some of them by helping the Yugoslavs in their struggle for a real liberation, in gratitude for the service which they rendered us in 1941.

We could still have some influence in the Balkans, as we saw at Church House. We must exercise it, lest the Yugoslavs justly reproach us with the words of Isaiah: "Your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity, your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness."

C. E. POLSON.

---

---

## SOME RECENT BOOKS

*The Criticism of Experience.* By D. J. B. Hawkins. (Sheed & Ward. Pp. 124. 5s.)

CONSTRUCTIVE work in epistemology is so rare that Dr. Hawkins's book has a peculiar importance. It is not a book for the beginner; nor does it take up those ultimate metaphysical questions which are the full context of epistemology. Its aim is to help the reader who has already a certain acquaintance with theories of perception by offering him an assessment of their development since Descartes. This takes the form of a genuinely critical analysis of the data issuing in a series of positive conclusions which provide a solid background for further study. There can be no question of Dr. Hawkins's success in this arduous task; he has achieved a remarkable combination of comprehensive treatment and serious philosophical writing which no student of the subject has any business to overlook. In so short a space his method could not be strictly historical; but he points to the sources of contemporary error and to the grounds for his own conclusions by a scholarly use of the classical texts (these belonging in the main, as he points out, to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—his claims for Sir William Hamilton are of particular interest). It will be perhaps a matter for surprise that a Catholic thinker should not make more use of the Scholastics. Dr. Hawkins's reply is that the "criticism of experience" refers to the modern critical problem with which the Scholastics were not directly concerned. He thus differs from those Thomist writers who seem to consider the work of Descartes and his successors as wholly misdirected. Some, at least, of their questions must not be simply rejected as improper but answered along lines which they themselves laid down. Their own answers indeed were largely inadequate; the trouble with the "critical" philosophy was that it failed to be sufficiently thorough-going—it is uncritical to be content with narrow views. Dr. Hawkins shows us how to retain the large-mindedness which ought to be the special character of the philosopher with the most painstaking scrutiny of evidence.

Certain conclusions will now be quoted in the hope of encouraging readers to persevere with a book which, though clearly written, inevitably demands very close attention. "The external object is only potentially black or white . . . in the sense that it is capable of stimulating these sensations" (p. 33). "Do we then have a primitive experience of finite mass? The answer is to be found in the consciousness of the body" (p. 58). "On the causal argument alone, the material world remains an unrefuted but quite unproved

hypothesis" (p. 92). "Intuitive memory is due to the assimilation of the present to the past under the influence of the past, or to a communication between the past and the present. Is there an analogous assimilation, or communication between the external world and ourselves, which would make intuitive perception intelligible? . . . it is in the experience of contact and mutual pressure that we find an intuition of other bodies for which sensation by itself offers no foundation . . . there where is not only causation but the communication of a similar quality to experience, the mind is fully equipped to be immediately aware not only of the present self but of that other object which is causally ingredient in it" (pp. 107-11).

It may be observed that Dr. Hawkins is concerned rather with the conditions of knowledge than with knowledge itself. He is more interested in the "communication of similar quality" to the senses than in the union of subject and object which is the essential fact of knowledge. This seems to be the real ground of a rather puzzling protest made by Fr. Columba Ryan, O.P., in a recent review (*Blackfriars*, February 1946). Why does Fr. Ryan object to appeals to intuition? What else could we expect from Dr. Hawkins? (But we may agree with Fr. Ryan that the account of "existence" on page 80 is unsatisfying.)

The value of Dr. Hawkins's incidental conclusions must be stressed. They cover a very wide field and cannot be dealt with in detail in a review (the proposal that we have intuition of other minds needs justification). The treatment of the *species* is particularly noteworthy. Dr. Hawkins distinguishes two Scholastic doctrines on this subject, a Thomist and a Suarezian, and attributes the crudities of so many contemporary accounts to a Suarezian source. For St. Thomas, he holds, the *species impressa* is "that assimilation of the subject to the object which is required in order that the subject may know something other than itself" (p. 116). This overworked topic is thus put into its proper place. Our text-book writers have much to learn from Dr. Hawkins.

DOM ILLTYD TRETHOWAN.

*The Divine Pity.* By Gerald Vann, O.P. (Sheed & Ward. 1945. 8s. 6d.) ACCORDING to St. Augustine's interpretation of St. Matthew, there are seven beatitudes, as there are seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, and seven sacraments. These represent the world's sublimest ethic, the Holy Spirit's special care of the individual soul, and the Incarnate Word's abiding presence and action in His Church. Are these three different religions, three conflicting interpretations of Christianity or—as the Catholic Church has always insisted—three integral parts

of God's august scheme for applying the Redemption to man? There is a certain type of modern prophet who finds the whole of Christianity in its ethic, as put before us in the Sermon on the Mount. Whatever Our Lord said afterwards, whatever else the Apostles preached, whatever Christians have stood for, all that is good in Christianity can be reduced to the seven beatitudes. Our Lord's miracles can be discounted, His claim to the Godhead disregarded, baptism and the eucharist and the other sacraments unheeded. All we need to know and all we need to do for the world's salvation, say these prophets, can be reduced to the opening verses of chapter five of St. Matthew. Our Lord thought He died for mankind. If He did so, it was only as a witness to the blessedness of the peacemaker and the clean of heart. The young Church boasted that the Holy Ghost poured down His gifts, but God was merely bringing home to them the blessings of poverty and meekness.

This modern exclusive appeal to the beatitudes comes partly as a natural reaction to the chaotic diversity of religious rites and dogmas which have distinguished those Christians who broke off from the centre of unity at the Reformation. It would do little harm if it were not so distortingly one-sided. In so far as it stresses the positive Christian message of unselfishness and mercy, it cannot be too highly praised. But in so far as it excludes our dependence on the Spirit and the Church of Christ, it has the effect of watering down that message either to a sentimental humanitarianism or a naturalistic or pantheistic mysticism. One aspect of any truth taken alone must give a false view. The beatitudes taken alone can be made to mean almost anything; and the modern prophets of whom I speak usually make them mean good conduct but not right doctrine. How easy it is to put our favourite philosophy of life into our interpretation of poverty, meekness, mourning and peace-making! If we belong to the sentimental English tradition, they will spell a milk-and-water humanitarianism. If we have social views, they will foretell to us the ultimate triumph and happiness of the depressed classes. If we are students of comparative religion and dabblers in eastern mysticism, they will mean the absorption of the ego into the All, and the eight-fold path of deliverance. If we incline to the "religion of the spirit", they will emancipate from the slavery of ritualism.

We Christians, however, interested as we are in these human efforts, come to Christ not to read into His words the religion or philosophy which most attracts us, whether Eastern or Western. We come to Him to learn. All that Christ says in the Sermon on the Mount flows from the purest source of truth, but it must be interpreted not in the light of the Buddha or of any other human philosopher, but in the light of the other teachings of the God-made-man. This means we cannot lightly lay aside His nature. He is God, and

all that He taught, as well as all that He instituted, is divine. The sacraments are not a rival scheme of religion to the Sermon. His teachings are not less important than His way of life. Whatever is sanctified by the Son of God is our salvation, and each part is necessary for the whole.

It is then highly gratifying to Catholics—at this time when so many “prophets” outside the Church lay claim to the beatitudes, even in opposition to her sacramental life—that Father Gerald Vann has taken the beatitudes as his subject of a new and “different” book of spiritual reading. In relating this code to the full Christian scheme, which Our Lord was only beginning to unfold when He first revealed it, he does us a great service. Catholics will be truly inspired by following Father Vann through the seven beatitudes, and learning how each of them can be most fittingly related to a gift and a sacrament. There is nothing forced in this. The beatitudes teach us to empty ourselves of self in order that we may put on God. The Holy Ghost ensures that we do this through His gifts; and Christ the Head of His Church has given us the most effective means in His sacraments.

It is to be hoped that those religious-minded non-Catholics who have forgotten the distinction between sacraments and magic, between divine truth and superstition, or between liturgy and formalism, will also come across Father Vann’s book. They will see that Catholic morality is not less pure in that it is sacramental, nor less noble in that it is childlike, nor less religious in that it is sacrificial.

For the reader unaware of these challenges to his Catholic position, Father Vann’s book will appeal for its combination of psychological insight with clear simple theology. St. Thomas is closely followed in his explanation of the gifts and virtues. The application is made mainly to family life, not only to the natural family circle, but to the larger family of the state and the world, and in a special sense the Church. The poor are especially those who use God’s goods carefully and disinterestedly for the good of the members of their family. The meek are devoted to their family interests. The mourners learn sympathy by their suffering, and help to redeem their brothers and sisters. Those who long for justice work strenuously for social justice. All members of the family must give and receive mercy from each other. Cleanliness of heart makes them worship God even in their natural family lives. The peacemakers unite all men to one another in uniting themselves and others to God.

I must not tell the reader more. He will be able to find for himself how the sacraments and gifts fit into this scheme. He will find that I have perhaps exaggerated, if I have given the impression that it is all about family life. He will certainly find that there is here a Catholicism applied to the needs and weakness of our time. The title of the book is taken from that of the chapter on the fifth beatitude.

It seems to me that Father Vann chose Pity or Mercy as central today because "it is the greatest possible repudiation of the kingdom of Mammon, at the farthest possible remove from the selfish struggle for *my rights, my pleasure, my comfort, my privacy*. Mercy is in those who have already learnt to think and to will in terms of the family" (p. 108).

H. FRANCIS DAVIS.

*Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity.* By Wilfred L. Knox, D.D. (Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d. net.)

To what extent was Christianity changed, after the death of its Founder, through contact with the Hellenistic world? This is a question which can only be answered after a thorough examination of the sources from which we derive the Christian message, and even then scholars of the highest repute give varied answers. Extremists like Couchoud say that everything is to be attributed to the primitive community and that Jesus never even existed. Bultmann and some of the Form-Critics would attribute the greater part of the Gospel to purely Hellenistic influences and much of the Palestinian "layer" to the Church, not denying the historical existence of Jesus but considering the spiritual truth of His message and character more important than the factual. On the other side are the conservative critics who appreciate the circumstances under which the evangelists had to work, the necessity of their expressing themselves not only in the Greek language but through Greek thought-forms, but who maintain that the essentials of the personality and message of the Founder of Christianity have been and are transmitted intact. Canon Knox goes a long way with the extremists, especially on the Fourth Gospel, but it is not a part of his theme to enter into the problem of the historical Jesus and he insists on the strength and persistence of the Palestinian element in the Synoptics; even John's philosophical background is shown to be one which could have been acquired outside Palestine, indeed, but in purely Jewish circles.

This is to place the discussion on its proper level. It is easy to say that the parallels which Reitzenstein and others have discovered between Gospel texts and the liturgical forms of Eastern religions may be due to borrowings from Christianity, because these liturgical forms belong perhaps to the second century A.D. But it is much more important to discover how far Oriental religion and Greek philosophy, while continuing their independent development, had already influenced Judaism—especially of the Diaspora—at the opening of the Christian era. It is also much more difficult to decide whether this outlook facilitated an authentic exposition of the message given to the Apostles or led to its misinterpretation. Palestinian Judaism was

aware of these influences, of course, but was very little affected by them, and Canon Knox rightly maintains that the earliest Gospels, or at least their sources, "are redolent of the soil of Palestine"; he holds that the religious vocabulary of the early Church "must have been vilely semitic".

He considers that the much-disputed text, Matt. xi, 25—Luke 1, 21 ff., is semitic in thought and structure, and that similar Hellenistic utterances must be considered as borrowed from Hebrew forms common enough in the Old Testament. In this he disagrees with Norden and shares the view of Meyer, without going so far as the latter in making it a purely liturgical, artificially constructed, albeit semitic formula. As Lagrange has shown, the *teaching* is entirely new and cannot satisfactorily be explained otherwise than as an utterance of Jesus, although the *form* is borrowed from Old Testament usage.

Similar judgements might be passed on other texts where Canon Knox is more inclined to admit Greek influences as originating not only the form but the content of a narrative or speech, but there is not space here, nor is it the task of a reviewer, to enter into a detailed discussion of problems which the book will undoubtedly help greatly to elucidate. We may be content to welcome the tendency to emphasize the Palestinian element, to note with the author the unique character of the canonical writings of the New Testament (as for instance the contrast between St. Paul and Philo in their use of the same proof-text), while regretting that he has not further developed the thought: "It would be inconceivable that the freshness and spontaneity of the (Fourth) Gospel were derived from the laborious pedantry of Philo." The use of "a common stock of midrashic tradition" might explain the resemblances; but the daring elaboration of that common stock, which makes the Gospel so fresh and spontaneous, which was beyond the power of the leading Jewish philosopher of his age, would also have been beyond the power of the Apostle John and still more of any other of the obscure writers to whom the Gospel has been attributed, if it had not already been made by Him who came not to destroy but to fulfil and is yet able to make all things new.

EDWARD QUINN.

l. by  
bels,  
; he  
have  
e x,  
istic  
com-  
arden  
er in  
mitic  
and  
ce of  
canon  
; not  
re is  
ailed  
reatly  
em-  
nique  
s for  
f the  
loped  
and  
rious  
ashie  
ration  
spon-  
philo-  
of the  
ers to  
made  
make

N. ch  
used  
I was  
and  
conci  
sider  
small  
and  
olito  
A 263